THE WORLD'S DEBT TO PROTESTANTISM

BURRIS JENKINS

Central BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

KANSAS CITY, KANSAS

Gt Charles Gray
1945

THE WORLD'S DEBT TO PROTESTANTISM

BY

BURRIS JENKINS

Boston, Mass.
The Stratford Company
Publishers

COPYRIGHT —— 1930 —— BY
THE STRATFORD COMPANY
Publishers
PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PRINTED BY
THE ALPINE PRESS, INC., BOSTON, MASS.

284
J52

To

ALEXANDER PROCTER

FOR FORTY YEARS MINISTER OF A CHURCH AT THE HEAD OF THE SANTA FE TRAIL IN OLD INDEPENDENCE, MISSOURI, A PIONEER LIBERAL OF THE MIDDLE WEST, AND GUIDE, PHILOSOPHER AND FRIEND TO THE AUTHOR, THIS BOOK IS DEDICATED IN GRATEFUL MEMORY

27520

Contents

I. American Treatment of Minorities . . . 1

II. The Age of Reason 15

III. Unearthing the Bible 27

IV. Religion Without Authority 41

V. Protestantism and Business 56

VI. Denominationalism 75

VII. Protestantism and Woman 90

VIII. Protestantism and the Family 107

IX. A Telling Century 126

X. Scientific Benevolence 146

XI. Reason and Education 163

XII. Religion and Recreation 181

XIII. Mysticism 199

XIV. The Growth of Nationalism 215

XV. Re-discovery of Jesus and the Kingdom of God 232

XVI. The Outlook for Protestantism 248

THE WORLD'S DEBT TO PROTESTANTISM

CHAPTER I

American Treatment of Minorities

THIS book is written not in praise of Protestantism, but in appraisal. It is intended in no sense as a polemic, but as a fair and just treatment of history in the scientific spirit for which, it is to be believed, Protestantism stands. The writer hopes that he is not an advocate of a cause, but the observer, impartial so far as human beings can be impartial, of the currents of thought for the last four or five centuries. Whenever we begin to attack, in heated blood, those who differ from us in opinion, then are we untrue not only to the reign of reason but also to the very spirit of the republic which we claim as ours and of all democracy in thinking and in government.

"God hath made of one all nations:" these words were spoken by a wide traveler, a cosmopolitan, a man of the world, St. Paul. The fact that he was a wide traveler and knew men of all nations closely and appreciatively enabled him to speak in this strain. An untraveled, narrow-minded provincial could never have spoken thus, except he be a man of universal genius and

with an innate sense for humanity, like Socrates or Jesus. Most people who show a prejudice against those of other races, other nations, or other religions, simply hang out a signal that they have never traveled, do not know their fellow-men, are ignorant and provincial. In several ancient languages the word "enemy" is the same as the word "foreigner." Those who made these two ideas interchangeable were infantile people, primitive, untraveled and unschooled. And those who still cherish the same conceptions in this modern time are belated remnants of bygone dark ages.

Do not believe for a moment that there is not a great deal of such heathenism still present in the world, particularly present, it may be, in America because we are an untraveled, and for the most part, provincial people. I have seen Englishmen in Italy or Greece contemptuous of the people who were their involuntary hosts; sometimes, though not so often, I have seen Germans adopt the same attitude of ignorant superiority; but I have seen any number of Americans, traveling perhaps for the first time, who elevated their noses and sniffed in disdain at the ways and the manners and even the language of the people among whom they were traveling and by whom, for a consideration to be sure, they were being entertained. I have even heard them blurt out, "Why can't they talk English! What a damn-fool language this is." Just because it was not their language! Perfectly childish and petty. Our Yankee boys in the army had no more than come into contact with British Tommies—whom they called "Limies," ignorantly, of course, because the word applies to British sailors and not soldiers—until

they began to have fist fights. Their complaint was, among other things, that they could not understand the English that these Englishmen spoke, and the English could not understand the American language. So they fought. Puerile, boyish, childish; but what can you expect when the intelligence quotient of the American army was about thirteen years of age. They had never traveled, had never met anybody outside their own country, and other ways and customs and other languages gave them a personal affront.

Now, what is true of the American army is equally true of the rank and file of the American people a few years older. The masses of the nation have no higher intelligence quotient than did the army, have not traveled any more, do not know any more. The vast majority of our countrymen have never been outside their own country; and a still smaller number speak any other language than their own, which, by the way, is borrowed from a foreign land. It is no wonder, then, that the mass of our citizenry hold narrow views of their relations with other races, other nations, other political views, and other religions. No wonder they err on the side of childishness and provincialism. The unusual and the strange is likely to excite, even in educated and traveled people, something of prejudice and hostility. What is to be expected of still smaller folk? They shout for a one hundred per cent Americanism, as if there were any such thing. A one hundred per cent American, truly representative of this polyglot nation, would have to have some English blood, some German, some French, some Italian, some Hungarian, some Hottentot, the

Lord knows what besides. More than that, he would have to embody in himself some of the spirit and even some of the ways of all these various folk. Nordic? That word has been run into the ground, and there is no such thing on American soil. Even Anglo-Saxon is fading out rapidly, lost, swamped, overwhelmed in the rush of all other tributary streams of blood from various parts of the world that have been poured into the mighty river of our republic.

Besides, suppose we still were Anglo-Saxon. What has the Anglo-Saxon done beyond all others to plume himself upon? He did not invent his own alphabet, his poetry, his music, his sculpture, or painting, or architecture, or drama. Mathematics and astronomy were born under Arabian skies; philosophy and logic under the shadow of the pyramids and the Acropolis; also such sciences as chemistry, mechanics, the use of metals—all these were invented and carried forward by dark-skinned races, mostly orientals. The Anglo-Saxon, to be sure, has taken up these arts and sciences, applied them, made practical use of them, adapted them to all kinds of machines and inventions; but he did not originate them. In the more spiritual of the arts it is doubtful if he has progressed beyond Arabs, Egyptians, Greeks, Hindus, and Chinese. Materially we are rich, powerful, inventive; but it is worthwhile to ask ourselves whether spiritually and artistically we may not be poor and childish and provincial. I am merely suggesting a little bit of modesty and humility of mind and heart, before grappling with the real question before us.

American Treatment of Minorities

I. Religious Intolerance, Jews

Is there by chance anybody reading this book who hates a Jew, or even does not like the Jew, who looks down upon or condescends to the Hebrew people? If so, do not hold up your hand. I would be ashamed to own it. I know some do, because I have heard them say it, and advertise to the world in so doing their utter ignorance. Don't we know that the Jews are the most persistent race in the world, and the most distinguished? Don't we know that they have given more to humanity to help it on the upward road than any other people in all human history? Don't we know that those little nomad tribes, settling finally in a tiny strip of narrow land along the east side of the Mediterranean, have given to the world two of the great religions which have spread from them to hundreds of millions of all races and today all but sway the world? If we don't know these things, our education has been neglected, we are twelve years old, or thirteen, in intellectual development.

"Oh, I am aware of all that, but what I don't like is the loudness and the assertiveness of the Jews, the way they push themselves." That is our fault, for treating them as we have for two thousand years. Discrimination, ostracism, persecution, repression, and suppression create an inferiority complex which causes a few people so suppressed to be over-ambitious and over-assertive. Some Jews have these faults, and are perfectly well aware of them, and deplore them; but they know, too, that these are directly the result of the discrimination

against them by the very people who object to these manifestations. It is our fault, we Americans, if the Jews among us are at times objectionable in behavior. It is because we dislike them, ostracize them, or at best condescend to them and tolerate them, that they rebound in self-assertion. We would do the same thing ourselves; we could not help it; the laws of psychology are invariable in their working. The Jews are well aware, too, of the hatred which so many people feel for them. I was riding in Central Park, New York, some years ago with one of the most distinguished Jews in America. Six feet and two inches tall, perfectly proportioned, slim as an Indian, features distinctly American. We were discussing some phases of national affairs when he suddenly broke out, "Oh, they all hate us Jews!" in a tone of unutterable bitterness. I protested that I thought he was mistaken, that I was sure that most of the American people cherished no such feeling; but he only shook his head and reiterated his assertion. I hope it is not true, I wish it were not true, but I am afraid that with the rank and file there is much truth in what he said.

II. RELIGIOUS INTOLERANCE, CATHOLICS

Then what about Catholics? Most Protestant Americans regard Catholics as they would pagans. The word causes more hostility in their minds than Pathan, Parsee, Buddhist, Mohammedan. And all the time, Catholics are Christians. They worship the same God, the Father, that we do; the same Jesus, the Son, that we do. They beat us hands down when it comes to charity and good works, and the tender guidance of little children. The

Protestant clergy might well learn something about education from the polished priesthood, with its knowledge of languages, with its wide travel, with its broad human sympathy and cosmopolitanism. Protestant women church workers, welfare workers and nurses, might well learn something from the sweetness and gentleness of the sisters and their knowledge of human nature. Perhaps they would be a bit less acrid themselves on occasion and in emergencies. Perhaps they would learn how to treat everybody alike and never to snub and to cut as they are so often given to doing.

"No, I hate the Catholics for their political activities!" Better hate the Methodists, then, for they are just as active politically, and if they had more numbers, would be just as powerful. Better hate the Campbellites, then, for in some states you cannot elect a governor without them. Better not hate anybody, then we shall be on the safe side. Just try to think what you would do, if you had the votes, and the influence; and better try to think concerning your own religious prejudices and how you would like to saddle other people with them if you could. It is really the strangeness of the usages of the Catholic church that offends us Protestants; in other words, it is our own ignorance. We don't like the celibacy of the clergy and of the sisterhoods. We don't like the confessional, with the power it gives the priesthood over the people. After all, what business are these things of ours? They don't affect us; they affect the Catholics. They don't affect society in any way that society has any right to take notice of. In fact, these usages, in many ways, have a wholesome effect upon the

social structure. Catholic people are tied to their churches, attend their churches, are held level by their churches in a way that Protestant people, we must confess, are not. And it is open to question whether some of our hostility is not after all envy and jealousy of the influence and the power the Roman church exercises over its own people and not over us. As for the anonymous attacks on priesthood and sisterhood that too often come through the United States mail to our desks and homes, they are beneath all contempt, having nothing American about them. Anonymity is the last refuge of the pale and pusillanimous and anæmic coward.

The world's debt to the Roman Catholic church cannot be gainsaid. It has served humanity in a thousand ways, in all parts of the world, and for many centuries. It kept Christianity alive all through the dark ages and the middle centuries; it preserved the scriptures in its libraries and monasteries in the oldest manuscripts we have. It kept alive the Holy Communion in unbroken succession from the earliest times in Christian history to the present hour so that it is safe to say not a single first day of the week has passed by from the night when Jesus first broke the bread and poured the cup with his disciples down to the present hour but that somewhere and by somebody this feast has been kept. Moreover it preserved through all these two millenniums the spirit of Christian charity, mercy for the poor and the suffering, even at times in an environment of the utmost indifference and cruelty. The well-worn words of Lord Macaulay are well-worn because they are so true, to the effect that the Roman Catholic church is

the greatest organization in the history of time and that it will endure when some traveler from New Zealand shall, amid a vast wilderness, stand upon a broken arch of London bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul's.

III. RACE INTOLERANCE

Of course, the most real race problem that we have in America is the Negro problem. Eleven millions of blacks let down among a hundred and eleven millions of whites to live side by side, to serve the same nation, keep intact the same government, construct and hold together the same society. It is a problem. No use not recognizing the fact. Do you hate Negroes? Do you dislike Negroes? Do you even condescend to Negroes? Just in proportion to your hatred, dislike, condescension, are you a bad citizen of America. A free and stable government cannot be built upon hatred, dislike, condescension toward anybody, no matter what his race or his religion. A republic cannot endure upon such foundations; and just in so far as we cherish such feelings are we treasonable to the republic. What we really dread, perhaps, is the intermingling of blood between the white and the black. This was more to be dreaded in slavery days, and shortly thereafter, than it is today. The danger is no longer so great, and the tendency seems to be in the other direction. This is the reason for the rigid social lines that are drawn, the segregation, and the fear of all social intermingling. This fear, however, need not drive us to the extreme of treating fellow human beings as if they were not human, as if they were not children of the common

Father. "God hath made of one"—not one blood, but closer than that; one organism, a single entity, one being, one family, one body—all men. That is what Paul said. The same hopes and fears, loves and longings, struggle in all human breasts regardless of the pigmentation of the skin or the origin of the race. To treat all men alike, as human beings, children of a common Father, to do as we would be done by, this is the Christian gospel and this is American citizenship. It may or may not mean social intermingling—that is beside the point. What it certainly does mean is that we are all children of the common Father and must bear ourselves as such.

There are those who believe that the future of this nation depends upon its treatment of its minorities. The majority rules, yes; but without consideration and respect for the minorities, no body of people, no government can long stand. A church whose official board decides matters by a bare majority vote will split. "Be sure of practical unanimity before you allow anything to come to a vote in your board," is the wise advice given me years ago by Dr. Thomas P. Haley, my predecessor in the pastorate of the Linwood Boulevard Christian church in Kansas City, Missouri. What applies to a church may well apply to any parliamentary body and to any nation. Persuasion, fellow-feeling, consideration, respect for the other man's opinion, even though he be in a minority, these things mark the good Christian and the good citizen alike.

My friend Ed V. Williams, of Springfield, Missouri, told me one time the following incident:

Two men came into his office in his department store, several years ago, one a banker friend, the other the organizer for the Ku Klux Klan. Mr. Williams said:

"Sit down, gentlemen, across that table. I know what you have come for. I want to tell you a story, and then you can decide whether you want me in your organization. My only son died of tuberculosis years ago in Colorado. I was a poor young business man and unable to be with him much in his last days. His closest friend was a young Catholic priest in the next cot, also dying of consumption. As the end drew near for my boy, he asked the Father to give him the last communion. The priest said, 'I can't do that, Mr. Williams, unless you become a Catholic, and all your people are Presbyterians; so, of course, you can't do that; but I'll tell you what I'll do, I'll go out and find a Presbyterian minister for you.' And he did, though in dying condition himself, find the minister; and together they gave the communion to my son.

"Once more, I was born and brought up in Georgia. My first playmates were little colored children. My first recollections of going to sleep were upon the comforting breast of my Negro mammy. I love the Negroes. I would not do anything to hurt them.

"Then, again, back in the 90's I was about on the ragged edge in business when my neighbor and competitor, Nathan So-and-So, came in and sat where you are sitting, saying to me, 'Ed, you're having a hard time; we all are; but I'm getting through, and I want to help you with a little money. You can pay me when you please.' And he handed across that table a check for what

was then a very substantial sum. I took it and slowly tore it up but thanked him and told him I would never forget it. We have been bosom friends ever since, though he now lives in Cincinnati. Not long ago I went to Battle Creek where they told me I'd have to have an operation. I wrote to Nathan, told him I was going under the knife Monday, not much of an operation, but still an operation. On Sunday morning I heard a tap at my door, said, 'Come in,' and there stood Nathan, that little Jew from Cincinnati. He said his doctor had told him he needed a two weeks' rest and he just thought he'd come up here and be with me.

"No, gentlemen, I wouldn't make a good member of your order."

" 'No,' said the organizer, as he slammed his fist down on the table. 'We don't want you in our order.' "

A little later the banker came back, thanked Mr. Williams for his story and said, "Ed, I came pretty nearly going into that order. Your story saved me from making a mistake."

IV. FAITH AND CONFIDENCE BRING TOLERANCE

Dr. S. Parkes Cadman in his volume on *Christianity and the State,* says, "Men who own allegiance to one Lord must cease to speak and write as though they had nothing but animosities to gratify, or selfish interests to advance. The healing of the church and the settling of the world depend upon a more irenic disposition in the two great branches of western Christianity. The commendable aspirations of nationalism, the moral ideals

that should be supported, the dreams of betterment by our finer spirits, and the practical needs which political leaders almost despair of meeting, cannot be materially helped by a contentious Christianity."

Timorous humanity is always afraid of the mysterious and the unknown. To most Protestants, Roman Catholic worship, beliefs, and social practices are shrouded in an impenetrable cloud of mystery. The Latin services, the black robes of nuns, the secluded celibate homes of the priesthood, the secrets of the confessional—all these seem to most Protestants dangerous just because they are strange. In the same manner, perhaps, to the Catholic mind the secrets and mysteries of the Masonic order, which many of us Protestants know to be harmless, ethical, and uplifting, may seem portentous and threatening.

The institutions of America are Protestant in origin and genius. If this counsel or this work be of men, it will be overthrown; but if it is of God, ye will not be able to overthrow them. It does not seem to me, for one, at all likely that the spirit and genius of our institutions will be shaken or encroached upon, let alone destroyed, by any minority whatsoever. It is lack of faith that breeds fear. Lack of faith in God breeds fear of atheism, although we know that atheism never can stand against increasing light and thought. It was lack of faith in the durability of our Christian church and body of teaching which made us afraid of scientific criticism of the scriptures, some forty or fifty years ago. It is lack of faith in the foundations of the truth which

always terrorizes us when anything we believe to be error raises its head. A firmer faith in the ground on which we stand, in the truth, in the right, always enables us to look calmly and confidently upon all horizons, no matter what clouds hang there. Whatever it is, and wherever and whenever, if it be of men, it will be overthrown; if it be of God, you cannot overthrow it.

CHAPTER II

The Age of Reason

THE age in which we live may, in a measure at least, be termed the age of reason, although reason is rarely unalloyed; so mixed is thought with emotion in all of us that it is hard for us to say when we are thinking and when we are feeling. A man sat in his club window in an easy chair, deep in a brown study; when a friend came by and asked him what he was doing, he replied, "Oh, just thinking." Then his friend said to him, "You think you're thinking, but you're not; you're just rearranging your prejudices." Our opinions are so inbred in us, or rather so breathed in from the atmosphere by which we are surrounded in childhood and early youth, that it is impossible for us to separate what we have voluntarily concluded from what we have unconsciously absorbed. Nevertheless, perhaps it is safe to say that, to a greater degree and over more widespread territory, this age is marked by rationalization more than any other in history.

Even popular writers, like Sir Phillip Gibbs, name books *The Age of Reason*. James Lane Allen, of Kentucky, in the closing years of the nineteenth century wrote a best seller called *The Reign of Law*. And Dr. Henry Van Dyke, at about the same time, labeled our day "An Age of Doubt." He affirmed that the coat of arms of this period is a question mark rampant over

three bishops dormant and its motto is "Query." That is to say that this age is an age of interrogation, which means an age of thoughtfulness, a time in which, like children, of whom one said that of such is the kingdom of heaven, we are bristling with questions, asking the earth and the sea and the sky what they are made of and why they are made, asking ourselves about our innermost and unconscious processes, asking the Creator who he is, what he is doing, what he intends, not stopping short at any bounds with our constant and persistent inquiries.

Perhaps we are not altogether aware how comparatively modern is this state of mind. There were long centuries, the dark ages and the middle ages, during which men's minds rested quietly and in silence. They were content with opinions inherited and handed down to them. Now and then, to be sure, a luminous mind burned like a lighthouse even in the darkness and the silence; but for the most part humanity cradled its head upon the breast of authority and slept the sleep of mental comfort and ease. It was not until about the sixteenth century that reason began to move and stir and visibly and audibly to breathe again. What we call the Renaissance came slowly creeping up beyond the eastern horizon like the sun. First a grey light, like that of early dawn, then long rosy rays, golden and crimson, spread over the sky from the Achaian peninsula, and then the full flood of daylight burst over darkened Europe. The Renaissance, literally the rebirth, the rebirth of ancient classic art and literature and philosophy with the suddenness of a new-born day, swept with light the western

world. So long men had forgotten the glory that was Greece and had buried it under the material grandeur that was Rome, that they were unaware of the great names, the great art, and the great thought that was their rightful heritage from the intellectual center of the ancient world. To be sure, the great artists and thinkers of the Renaissance still worked and thought under their old authority, Michael Angelo, Leonardo, Raphael, and an army of followers; but the logic of their activity brought inevitably a still larger birth, the birth of the age of reason. The Renaissance rendered the Reformation irrepressible. Michael Angelo was the first father of Martin Luther. To change the figure, the ground swell set in motion in Italian churches, on the ceiling of the Sistine, on the walls of the refectory at Florence, in Giotto's duomo, this tidal wave of fresh, new, world-stirring art and literature and philosophy, so shook the earth that old structures even in the north of Europe and in Britain came tottering and crashing to the ground. Old authorities gave way to new freedoms.

I. IRRECONCILABLE HUMAN DESIRES

The human mind is a strange mixture of opposites, and among these not the least strange is its yearning for rest and at the same time for liberty. It loves repose, and it also loves freedom. Between these opposites it swings back and forth like a pendulum in its arc. At one time it demands rest, peace, the folding of the hands in sleep, repose upon the assured and substantial bosom of authority; and another time it insists upon standing alone, running about, pioneering in strange places and blazing

trails for itself. It may even mingle the two moods, and does mingle them, at one and the same time. No matter how independent the mind, nevertheless in some things, upon some subjects, it holds on with a death grip to old and cherished conservatism; in other words, it runs in its favorite ruts. A man may be never so large a philosopher in dealing with the Einstein theory or international fraternity, but question him about his diet, or his hour of calisthenics, and he is as fixed by some outside authority as Polaris is fixed in the sky. He may be as big and as liberal as John Stuart Mill or Huxley upon all scientific and philosophical affairs, but question him about the tariff or states' rights and he blindly follows his party to the bitter end. He may be as broad as Bertrand Russell on psychology and pedagogy and as narrow as H. L. Mencken on Methodists and prohibition. A strange admixture is little man! Authoritarian on one day of the week or in one realm of thought, and an explorer of far places in another.

Inertia, no doubt, belongs to all of us, the desire to come to rest, to remain in one place, to find peace. Modern students of the mind tell us that all life is one long seeking for rest and peace until at last we find it in the grave. On the other hand, effort, action seem just as needful to the fully rounded man; and these two tendencies make war the one upon the other. Much of the time and in many ways we like to have our conclusions given to us, cut and dried, fixed and finished, once and for all, with no room for doubt. The more untutored the mind, and the less it has been trained in mental gymnastics, the more it desires all questions settled for it

without travail and without effort; but once turned loose on the paths of exploration or in the wilderness of inquiry, the less it is content with opinions handed down; it must test and try for itself and reach its own conclusions. Perhaps it is best for humanity, on the whole, that these two tendencies should so strongly govern the human mind. They serve as centrifugal and centripetal forces, both necessary to equilibrium; they serve as the weighted ends of a balance pole by which the tightrope walker is enabled to hold himself in poise. Conservative and radical, while pulling against each other, both help to stabilize the thought and the institutions of their day. Without the conservatives, human beings might run away with themselves and with society; without the radicals, humanity, rooted deep in its prejudices, might rot and spiritually die.

II. THE REFORMATION BROUGHT UNREST

The swing of the pendulum which began with the Renaissance culminated in the Reformation. Martin Luther gave it a mighty shove and shook off authority in all its forms. Monasticism, celibacy of the clergy, indulgences, all the technical abuses and extremes in the authoritarianism of his time moved him and his followers to revolt. The mind of Germany made a declaration of independence, and neighboring countries were soon infected with the revolution. Switzerland, Holland, England soon joined the procession and unfurled banners of freedom. A giant stride nearer to the age of reason moved the western world. Clear across the Atlantic swept the revolt and a new country, conceived in free-

dom and dedicated to independence, came out of the womb of time. America undoubtedly was founded by Protestants, Puritan and Cavalier; the revolution of the colonies against England was fought largely by Protestants, although Washington thought the services of the Irish Catholics sufficiently important to the time to make to them a special address at the close of the war, thanking them for their loyalty and their devotion to the cause of freedom. Thus on the northern lines of latitude from the Danube on the east to the Mississippi on the west, the world of the seventeenth century found itself bathed in a new, strange, golden light, the morning light of the age of reason. Many and profound changes began their incubation under that morning sun which, when fully hatched and grown, made a new world, whether better or worse perhaps remains to be seen, but none the less a totally new and different world from any that had ever gone before. We are living in it now.

The inevitable antinomy of the human mind led almost immediately to a back swing of the pendulum. Too much freedom it could not endure. Some form of authority it demanded and it found. In place of the papal authority and that of the church, the minds of men demanded some other infallible source from which to derive their doctrines and opinions. Soon after Luther, then, his followers and imitators, feeling the need of such an infallible rock on which to set their feet, erected the Bible as a source of authority, incontestable, unchanging and final. They did not see the logic of their position, the necessity for interpreters of the Bible, and

the wide divergences of view that must follow upon the personal equation; but they were content that at last their minds, so long footloose and wandering, should find solid ground on which to build. This infallible source of authority has lasted in many minds clear down to the present day. We find, for example, a premier of England, William Ewart Gladstone, writing a book on *The Impregnable Rock of Sacred Scripture.* We find Protestant ministers and laymen still proving their contentions by the texts of sacred scripture. What the Bible says is in their judgment the end of all controversy. Here is the restless human mind, for all its restlessness and its storm-tossed voyages, seeking a haven and an anchorage, and laying to its soul the flattering unction that it has found one, in the infallibility of the Bible.

III. REFORMATION ENDED IN SECTISM

The inevitable result of this cutting loose from old authority and the attempt to replace it by a shifting and changeable one was division, sectism, separation into hundreds of denominational bodies which emphasized various phases of faith and philosophy. No more was the Reformation fairly launched until the picture of such a controversial division arises before our minds. There sat Luther, leonine of face and lion hearted, on one side of a pine-top table, and Zwingli, the gentle and mild and sweet spirited, on the other side, disputing about the Eucharist. Luther insisted upon a literal transubstantiation, that the word of scripture meant literally and legally what it said, that the bread was the actual body of Christ, and the wine the actual blood of

Christ. Zwingli maintained that the bread was only the representation, the figure, the concrete picture of the broken body of Jesus, that the language, "This is my body," was intended to be figurative and symbolic. Luther would not budge, his bull-neck swelled with the intensity of his emotion and his stubbornness, as he took a piece of chalk and wrote on the top of the table, *"Hoc est meum corpus"*—"This is my body." Here he took his stand even as he did at the Diet of Worms, and if every tile on the roof of the buildings had been a devil he could not be driven from his position. It was another case of "Here I stand. I can do nought else. God help me, amen." Here was the appearance of sectism, the first-born child of the new freedom; but it was only the first; it was followed by a progeny which has kept up to the present time, birth after birth, and the end is not yet.

Next that great Frenchman, John Calvin, with headquarters at Geneva, disdaining all earthly luxury and emolument, or even prestige and power, with a keen, sharp, legalistic mind and a will of steel, holding on to his convictions with a death grip, does not hesitate to do to death those who cherish convictions of their own. The historic case of Servetus who paid with his life for differing from John Calvin, you may be very sure is only one of those in which the unbending determination of this great thinker would have sent opponents to the block or the fagot if he could. The world owes much to John Calvin, of independence of thought, of daring of spirit; but it owes much, too, of unyielding legalism, a proud Pharisaism, and a bigotry that would not stop at persecution to attain its end. Much of the theology of

modern fundamentalism in the Protestant church has been handed down to it from St. Paul by way of St. Augustine, melted and transmuted in the crucible of the Genevan doctor, John Calvin. Nobody can say how much of the unlovely spirit of the most intolerant of the denominations is a direct heritage from the steel and sinew soul of this relentless Frenchman.

The other great dividers come trooping down the pages of history from that day to this. A great leader arose, gave new emphasis to some phase of the many-sided message of Christianity until finally he erected it as a test of loyalty and orthodoxy. The Wesleys came and upon simplicity and asceticism of life laid their stress until they built up a huge following of their own way of thinking; and although those who came after them have long since lost all trace of their original idealism and are living just as luxuriously and materially as anybody else, nevertheless tradition, use and wont, the rut into which it is so easy for the wheels of humanity to sink, still holds in line many millions of Wesleyans. From Switzerland, too, came the sect of the Anabaptists, who rejected the baptism of infants and stressed adult baptism by immersion only, spreading westward through Germany and into England, thence to the United States; so that another great denomination was built up around a single form and ceremonial in the administration of the Christian ritual. Interesting to relate, two powerful men, Thomas Campbell and Alexander Campbell, father and son, originated a denomination on American soil with the delusive hope of drawing to-

gether into one all the multitudinous sects which, up to the beginning of the nineteenth century, had multiplied among the Protestants. So far from succeeding in uniting the divided and dissevered members of Christ's body, the church, they only succeeded in adding one, and maybe two or three, additional bodies to about one hundred and fifty already existent in this free republic.

IV. ATTEMPTS AT UNITY

It is easy to see how, under a régime of absolute freedom of thought, any powerful personality, stressing his own favorite aspect of religious teaching, can and will inevitably draw after him large numbers of followers who will soon call themselves after his name or after his doctrines. Even attempts at unity are mistakenly made over and over again by trying to put down on paper propositions, agreements, definitions, creeds. These attempts are fated never to succeed; for every additional attempt at a treaty of union, a confession of faith, a creed, an additional denomination is always formed. World assemblies have been called time and again in the last four centuries seeking to draw together these warring sects either into an organic union or into at least an armed truce of apparent unity; and every one of these great conferences has ended with the denominations no closer together than they were when it began. History repeats itself. The same thing began to take place when Christianity had but just begun, and we find St. Paul, with a sort of helplessness, exhorting the people at Corinth to hang together. According to the Moffatt

translation, his words run like this: "Brothers, for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ I beg of you all to drop these party-cries. There must be no cliques among you; you must regain your common temper and attitude. For Chloe's people inform me that you are quarreling. By 'quarreling' I mean that each of you has his party-cry, 'I belong to Paul,' 'And I belong to Apollos,' 'And I to Cephas,' 'And I to Christ.' Has Christ been parceled out? Was it Paul who was crucified for you? Was it in Paul's name that you were baptized?. . . . For with jealousy and quarrels in your midst, are you not worldly, are you not behaving like ordinary men? When one cries, 'I belong to Paul,' and another, 'I belong to Apollos,' what are you but men of the world? Who is Apollos? Who is Paul? They are simply used by God to give you faith, each as the Lord assigns the task."

Yet when all is said and done, this inextricable confusion, this often strident and clamorous and futile emphasis upon non-essentials, this sectism, is not exclusively Christian. It characterizes other virile and vital religions as well, and may after all be regarded as a mark of growth and expanding power. It may certainly, with all legitimacy, be regarded as a mark of freedom. When men's minds have liberty to range and roam, they go far apart. Only when they are bound down by outside restrictions and authority can they be forced into moulds and made identical. These wide divergences of the denominations, and the bickering and strife and jealousy which follow upon them, may often make the heart

sick to contemplate; they fritter away forces which, if united and pulling together, might move the world; they are extravagant beyond all comprehension, both of money and man-power and also of spiritual penetration; nevertheless, they are the price it seems we have to pay for freedom of thought, for independence of judgment, for the age of reason.

CHAPTER III

Unearthing the Bible

THE story of the way in which the Protestant mind dug up the Bible, after some fifteen centuries during which it had lain practically in the tomb, reads like a romance. For four centuries that have just passed this process has gone forward, all unconsciously, to be sure, to the rank and file, but with a deadly determination on the part of certain leading minds; and as we scan the activities of these four centuries concerning the Bible, with all the light we can now throw upon them and in their full perspective, the obstacles men overcame, the opposition and hardship they endured, the ostracism and even martyrdom they met, the spectacle profoundly thrills us.

During the dark and middle ages the Bible, in the form of the Latin Vulgate and the Greek Septuagint, was in the hands of just a few scholars among the ecclesiastics. The Vulgate, the authorized translation of the church of Rome, made by St. Jerome, was open to such of the clergy as were prepared or sufficiently interested to read it; but these were very few. The Septuagint—so named from the seventy scholars who, according to tradition, had each separately in his own cell made a translation of the Old Testament and upon comparing their versions had found them all identical—appealed to still

fewer of the clergy, those who were acquainted with the Greek tongue. The masses of the people knew nothing about the Bible, as they were unacquainted with the ancient languages; and no translations into their own tongues existed. Furthermore, the church frowned upon popular acquaintance with the sacred writings, the feeling being that the less the people knew about the technicalities of their faith and its origin the better it would be for them and the more docile and tractable they would remain.

Luther read the Bible with great avidity; and this reading went far in making him a rebel against tradition and a campaigner against the existing order. He felt the need of a translation of the Scriptures in the popular tongue and so made one, which is still the Bible of the German people. Luther himself did not consider the Scriptures infallible; he considered some parts much more valuable than others and did not quote indiscriminately from any and every part of them. For example, he called the Epistle of James an "epistle of straw" on account of the undue emphasis he felt that it laid upon works instead of faith. On the other hand, he spoke in his rough way of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians as his wife, his Katherine von Bora, because he took it to bed with him every night; it has in it the elements of battle and rebellion against traditional authority which appealed strongly to Luther as a parallel to his own situation. It was only gradually, as Luther's followers felt the need of some infallible authority, that the doctrine of the infallible Bible grew up.

I. TRANSLATIONS OF BIBLE APPEAR

In English there had been since 1384 a translation from the Latin by Wyclif, but it had never gone far, was antiquated in style at the time of the Reformation, and filled nobody's needs. Wyclif had paid for his version with his life. Erasmus, the Oxford scholar, who was the first to publish the Greek text of the New Testament in 1516, wrote in the introduction: "I totally disagree with those who are unwilling that the sacred scriptures, translated into the vulgar tongue, should be read by private individuals, as if Christ had taught such subtle doctrines that they can with difficulty be understood by a very few theologians, or as if the strength of the Christian religion lay in men's ignorance of it. . . . I would wish all women, even, to read the gospel and the Epistle of Paul. I wish they were translated into all languages of all peoples, that they might be read and known not merely by the Scotch and Irish, but even by the Turks and Saracens. . . . I wish that the ploughman might sing parts of them at his plough, and the weaver at his shuttle, and that the traveller might beguile with their narration the weariness of his way."

It was only six years later that Luther's German translation appeared, and three years later than that Tyndale's English version. A certain learned ecclesiastic had opposed putting the Bible into popular form, in William Tyndale's presence, and the latter, with a side-glance at the language of Erasmus, had hotly replied, "If God spare my lyfe, ere many yeares I wyl cause the boye that dryveth the plough shall know more of the

scripture than thou doest!" Tyndale made good his words and, like Wyclif, paid for his translation with his life. Discouraged and even prevented from doing his work in England, he became an exile on the continent, hunted and hounded from pillar to post, surreptitiously printing his Bibles with the new-found art of printing and smuggling them into England even in bales of merchandise. The bishops bought up his editions as fast as they were printed, to burn them, but this only poured money into Tyndale's possession for the printing of more Bibles. The people seized upon them eagerly, and when no single individual in a community was financially able to own one, they frequently bought one as a congregation and chained it to the pulpit so that any one might go there and read it; and before Tyndale's martyrdom—for his enemies finally got him, his dying words being, "Lord, open the King of England's eyes!" —he had fulfilled his prediction and the plough boys of England were familiar with the gospel stories. After a long imprisonment, they strangled him and burned his body.

Translation after translation followed Tyndale's production and, indeed, utilized his very language, until finally under King James I, in 1611, the so-called authorized translation was made by a company of scholars and is handed down to this day as the favorite Bible of the English-speaking peoples. A great deal of Tyndale's phraseology survives in this King James translation; as a matter of fact, most of it, with its archaic quaintness and its idiomatic turns of phrase, is in the language originally given to it by the devoted Tyndale.

Such a hold has this authorized version upon the English mind that it is constantly quoted, more or less unconsciously, all over the western world; and so has it become embedded in Protestant affection that the revised version of 1881 and subsequent translations made by a number of individuals have not yet succeeded in uprooting it. Ministers still think it wise in sick-rooms and at funerals to use the King James version rather than more accurate later translations, because of the long familiarity of the people with the phrasing and because of the reverence in which they hold it. As a matter of fact, the managing editor of a great municipal daily in this country wrote to me one time protesting against the use which I had made of a freer translation, saying, "The St. James translation is the purest and best English in our language and liberties ought not to be taken with it." He loved the book although he did not even know the proper name for it.

II. GROWTH OF THE THEORY OF INFALLIBILITY

In spite of the changing forms of scripture translation, the doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible grew apace. In their controversies with the mother church and among themselves in the rapidly growing number of denominations, the Protestants began appealing to the scriptures as a source of authority. They failed to allow for individuality in interpretation, and they failed to discriminate among the different books from which they quoted. They rapidly came to think of the entire Bible as one book instead of a whole library of documents of varying value bound together between the lids of a single

volume. They quoted without choice or reason from the Old Testament or the New; indeed, the habit has not yet been broken; and people still quote from Deuteronomy or the Psalms or Proverbs giving equal weight to the quotations as if they were drawn from Jesus or John or St. Paul. "The Bible says so and so," and that is the end of all controversy. The popular attitude of nearly four centuries is not easy to eradicate.

One of the strengthening causes of the doctrine of infallibility of the Bible is the division into chapters and verses. Of course, there was originally no such division in the ancient manuscripts; but the narratives ran steadily and solidly forward without divisions of any kind. The divisions into chapters and verses were made purely for convenience of reference. A French printer, Robert Estienne, who was making a concordance of the New Testament, desired a smaller unit of reference than chapters and so he arbitrarily divided each chapter up into verses, and did most of the work on horseback during a journey from Paris to Lyons, making a total of seventy-nine hundred and fifty nine verses. It is easy to see how this versification tended to impress certain isolated and disconnected sayings upon the minds of readers, and how easy it became to regard these sayings as oracles. The very word "oracles" later became the name of certain translations made by individual scholars—"The Oracles of God" and the like.

John Locke anticipated the probable effect of these arbitrary divisions and deplored "the dividing of them into Chapters and Verses, as we have done, whereby they are so chop'd and minc'd, and as they are now

Printed, stand so broken and divided, that not only the Common People take the Verses usually for distinct Aphorisms, but even Men of more advanced Knowledge, in reading them, lose very much of the strength and force of the Coherence, and the Light that depends on it. . . . These Divisions also have given occasion to the reading these Epistles by parcels and in scraps, which has farther confirmed the Evil arising from such partitions. And I doubt not but every one will confess it to be a very unlikely way to come to the Understanding of any other Letters to read them Piecemeal, a bit today and another Scrap tomorrow, and so on by broken Intervals. . . . How plain soever this Abuse is, and what Prejudice soever it does to the Understanding of the Sacred Scripture, yet if a Bible was printed as it should be, and as the several parts of it were writ, in continued Discourses where the Argument is continued, I doubt not but the several Parties would complain of it, as an Innovation, and a dangerous Change in the publishing these Holy Books. . . . They would most of them be immediately disarm'd of their great Magazine of Artillery wherewith they defend themselves, and fall upon others, if the Holy Scripture were but laid before the Eyes of Christians in its due Connection and Consistency." No better description could have been written of exactly what has happened. The verses have been used as magic talismans, and almost anything has been proved to the satisfaction of those who quoted them.

III. TEXTUAL CRITICISM SHAKES INFALLIBILITY

In the nineteenth century, however, began two move-

ments in scholarship which surely and relentlessly dug the foundations from under Protestant bibliolatry and brought the whole structure of scriptural infallibility crashing to a fall. First was the search for a pure text of the New Testament. The originals from which the earlier translations were made consisted partly of the Latin Vulgate, itself a translation from the Greek, and partly of manuscripts dating from the middle ages and more or less corrupt. The first of the great uncials, or manuscripts in capital letters, made only four or five centuries after Christ, was the so-called Codex Alexandrinus, sent in 1628 as a present to the king of England by the patriarch of Constantinople. The name codex means a book with leaves—not a roll—printed by hand on vellum or sheepskin, often beautifully illuminated. The Alexandrian manuscript dates from the fifth century, and did not arrive in England until after the King James version had been made. During succeeding generations, copy after copy of the manuscripts of the New Testament began to appear through the tireless search of scholars east and west. Sometimes this search took on a romantic, arduous, and even hazardous complexion.

The story of Tischendorf, of the University of Leipzig, is an especially fascinating one. He worked with tremendous energy over manuscripts, deciphering writings that had been almost washed off the sheepskin and written over again with later and oftentimes worthless treatises. With chemicals, he could restore the original. These twice-written manuscripts are called palimpsests. Not content with the materials at hand, he sought far and wide for others whenever he could obtain the neces-

sary money. He went to Egypt to Mt. Sinai in 1844, and in the ancient convent of St. Catherine the monks gave him forty-three leaves of a beautiful old manuscript of the Septuagint, or Old Testament in Greek, which they were about to throw away. He cherished the feeling for many years that the rest of that manuscript, including the New Testament, was still in existence and somewhere around that convent. He went back in 1853 and again in 1859 in attempts to find it. After enduring great hardships and after patiently trying to persuade and cajole the monks, he was about to give up and go away; he had ordered his camels for the next morning; when one of the friars, the steward of the monastery, took him into his cell and unrolled from a red cloth the manuscript he had so long desired. Fearing they might take it away from him, he sat up all night copying the so-called "Epistle of Barnabas" of which he had never before seen a Greek text. He was finally allowed, however, to bring away the famous "Codex Sinaiticus," which has turned out to be one of the oldest and purest of the original texts of the New Testament. Upon it he based what is known as Tischendorf's Greek New Testament, which for many decades was the leading New Testament text.

It was not till near the end of the nineteenth century that Westcott and Hort's Greek Testament supplanted it, the work of two Englishmen who gave their lives to the perfecting of the original from some twenty-five hundred Greek manuscripts of the New Testament or parts of it, one hundred and fifty of them being uncials, dating from the third to the ninth centuries. These two

Englishmen worked over their edition for twenty-eight years before publishing it. Westcott did many things besides this and became a bishop, but Dr. Hort did nothing else during this whole period.

Imagine the immense amount of work trying to get down to the bottom of all this mass of material covering fifteen hundred years. As a result of all these labors, we know the exact words of St. Paul and of Jesus better perhaps than any other generation from their time to this. The result of a whole century of such indefatigable investigation in what is called textual criticism was inevitably to create in the minds of people who know about it doubts as to the validity of this passage and that text. There can be no infallibility about a book concerning whose actual readings there can be such variety of opinion. No other mass of literature has ever been subjected to such intense scrutiny as has this pile of manuscripts of the New Testament. No such army of scholars of the very first rank has ever been launched upon any subject of investigation in the history of the world. Almost exclusively, these were Protestant scholars steadily undermining the once cherished Protestant dogma of the infallibility of sacred scripture.

IV. HIGHER CRITICISM AND INFALLIBILITY

The second story is that concerning the so-called "higher criticism." At Tubingen in Germany a professor named Ferdinand Christian Baur sprang upon the astonished world of scholarship the idea that the books of the New Testament were each of them and all of them written with a certain polemic purpose or tendency. He

found the key to these varying purposes in the controversy recorded in the fifteenth chapter of Acts between St. Paul on the one side and the rest of the apostles on the other. The twelve insisted that all new members of the church must enter it by the gate of Judaism, must be circumcised. Paul insisted that this was not necessary, was a Judaic rite and not a Christian one, that the law had been done away with in Christ. Baur maintained that this controversy split the apostolic church into two opposing camps, and that every document put forth, and now become a part of the New Testament, was written to bolster up either the cause of Paul or the cause of James and Peter, the heads of the twelve. Read over the fifteenth chapter of Acts and you will see as plain as your hand before your face the ground upon which Professor Baur could base his theory. Like most scholars, particularly German ones, he mounted his hobby and rode fast and furiously, until section after section, document after document, of the New Testament flew out of his pockets as spurious, unauthentic, or at least strongly marked with controversy. Succeeding generations from the time of the Tubingen school down to the present have weighed Baur's theory, have taken from it what is valuable, and thrown away what was exaggerated and grotesque; but in the process of weighing the higher criticism as to its validity, the increasing and irresistible drift of scholarship has been toward a critical and unbiased examination of the New Testament books in just the same scientific fashion with which men deal with any literature; and still further, inevitably, the infallibility of the Bible has waned.

Another fact, established by the higher criticism, has had great weight in the minds of scholarly men and has gradually sifted down in increasing fashion to the public at large. That is that many of the books of the Bible are undoubtedly of composite origin, written by more than one hand, pieced together from two or more documents. Almost any amateur can detect this fact in reading the book of Genesis, where there are two accounts of creation, of the Garden of Eden, of the flood, and so on, running side by side or intertwined. The same thing appears in a number of the other Old Testament books. A parallel to this practice is to be found in the columns of modern newspapers. There occurs, for example, a great fire or a striking murder, and a number of reporters are sent out to gather facts about it; they write their stories or telephone them in to the office where they are written; and then the various parts are pieced together into a connected whole; a skilful reader can determine oftentimes where the work of one reporter leaves off and that of another begins.

The same composite character has at times been declared to exist in certain of the New Testament books. For example, it is believed by careful scholars that the speeches of Jesus in Matthew were set down some time before the book itself was written, and possibly even circulated under the name of "The Logia," or "Sayings of Jesus," reported by Matthew. It is known that such a document as "The Logia" was in existence and was attributed to the publican apostle who may have made copious notes or may even have taken down the words of Jesus in shorthand, as shorthand is known to have

existed at that time. Furthermore, the fact that the first three gospels are identical in so many passages is good ground for the belief that they may all have been taken from some one document older than the three or that two of them must have been partly copied from the other one. Indeed, the so-called synoptic problem, the problem of the first three gospels which are so much alike, is one of the hardest nuts that New Testament scholars have had to crack. No satisfactory solution to it has even yet been found.

This rapid survey of the past century of unparalleled study of the Bible and its documents, all too brief and unsatisfactory, nevertheless must convey to our minds something at least of the devastating effect upon the Protestant dogma of infallibility. The doctrine simply cannot stand against the overpowering force of this scholarly concentration.

How, then, shall the scriptures be treated by reverent readers and worshipers? The only enlightened attitude to assume in this age of reason is the same as that we would assume toward any other body of literature if only it were concerned with such high themes. These books must be weighed in the balances of literary appreciation and criticism, must be tested by common sense and accepted for whatever their truth and beauty and goodness are worth, no more, no less. There is beauty enough and truth enough and inspiration to goodness enough, in all conscience, to be found in these sacred writings. It is thanks to the Roman church that these incomparable documents were preserved through all the wreck of the Roman empire and handed down to suc-

ceeding generations. It is thanks to Protestant scholarship that patiently and with herculean effort translations were made first from the Vulgate, then from better and better collections of original Greek manuscripts, until today we possess a Bible more accurate than has ever been possessed in the Christian era. It is thanks to Protestantism that the Bible is the best seller among all books and that every plough boy, every soldier, every seaman, and every working girl, may buy one for a few pennies and obtain the solace and the courage which these sacred words can impart.

CHAPTER IV

Religion Without Authority

THE human mind strains away from authority and yet clings to it. As St. Paul said of another matter, we are divided betwixt the two, and what we would we wot not. We like to be free to range and reason for ourselves; and yet when we get too far from shore, panic seizes us and we look about for some safe and sure place to drop anchor. We are like Bruce's spider, swinging in the air at the end of the strand of web which we spin out of our own souls, and yet we swing back and forth from side to side trying to get a foothold on something solid, substantial, and authoritative.

The end result of Protestantism is freedom from authority, each one sailing the seas for himself, reasoning and thinking for himself; and if ever the human mind attains to such freedom of thought and experience, it will owe this freedom to the Protestant spirit; and in so far as human minds today have reached such liberty, it is to the Protestant spirit that they owe it. This is not to say that in all times, and under all churches and religions, there have not been bold and independent spirits who have attained and maintained individual liberty; but it is to say that, comparatively speaking, the last four hundred years have produced that attitude in masses of minds east and west to a degree perhaps not equaled in other periods. The progress toward this freedom, and

progress it undoubtedly may be called, has been spasmodic and spotted; it has gone forward and receded by fits and starts, here a little and there a little; but on the whole an advancement has surely been made.

I. PROTESTANTISM AFRAID OF ITS OWN LOGIC

Within the last fifty years we have heard many and resounding debates upon the source of authority in religion, the assumption being that authority there must somewhere be, the only question being as to its location. The mere fact of this division of sentiment clearly indicated that the Protestant churches realized they were cut adrift from any final and unchangeable base of authoritarianism. They had long ago given up papal and ecclesiastical infallibility; they had swung over to a scriptural source of authority and found it crumbling under their feet. With a divided mind, they groped and grasped for an impregnable rock; some still clinging blindly to scriptural infallibility, some to an indefinite and intangible something that they called the spirit of the church, or the Christian consciousness, and some to other floating spars and wreckage. They were not yet ready to accept the logic of their intellectual revolt against authority and declare without equivocation that there is no source of authority in religion. Even yet, come out boldly with that declaration—there is no source of authority in religion—and cold chills go up and down many devoted spines. The declaration, however, is inescapable for any who launch out into the Protestant river of thought. Either one has got to stay by the old church that dates almost from the apostolic age, or else he has

got to launch out upon a course of thinking which brings him to the inevitable conclusion that there is no source of authority in religion.

Religion has no place for authority. In fact, there is very little place for authority in human life at all; the less the better. There is place for authority in an army and a police force, but the army is a necessary evil in the present state of society and we are hoping against hope that armies may ultimately be done away with. An army cannot be successfully and efficiently conducted except upon an authoritarian basis. There must be obedience, absolute and unquestioned. "Theirs not to make reply; theirs not to reason why; theirs but to do and die"—that is the very law of being in an army. Without this authority the terrible machine could not be held together, its line of supplies kept intact, and its operations carried on with any degree of safety and coherence. For such unmitigated authority there is, according to the Protestant, the scientific, and, we may fairly say, the modern mind, no place anywhere else besides the army.

II. AUTHORITY DOES NOT BELONG IN THE FAMILY

Our modern psychology is teaching our reluctant minds that there is no place for such authority, for example, in the family. We are rapidly learning what devastation may be wrought by the exercise of the old paternal and maternal authority. We no longer treat a child as a subject who must unquestioningly obey a sovereign will. We treat him, on the contrary, as a personality, with God-given rights that may not be invaded; we treat him, if we are wise, as a character to

be dealt with courteously, respectfully, by the use of reason, and with all the deference and good form with which we would treat an adult. Difficult I know it is, with our traditions of authority, to bring ourselves to this logical attitude, and yet gradually, with growing light, we are achieving it. Increasingly we are aware of the warped and twisted lives whose misfortune may be traced directly to the abuses of the old ideas of authority. To enforce the will of the adult upon the child just because it is the will of the physically stronger, to compel a child to behave like an adult just because it makes things easier for the adults round him, we now recognize to be unscientific, out of harmony with the freedom to be and to grow which belongs to the present era, and to lead often to direful consequences.

Speaking of the chaotic condition of moral standards and values in the present age, in *A Preface to Morals,* Walter Lippman has this illuminating paragraph: "It is often said that this distrust is merely an aspect of the normal rebellion of youth. I do not believe it. This distrust is due to a much more fundamental cause. It is due not to a rebellion against authority but to an unbelief in it. This unbelief is the result of that dissolution of the ancient order out of which modern civilization is emerging, and unless we understand the radical character of this unbelief we shall never understand the moral confusion of this age. We shall fail to see that morals taught with authority are pervaded with a sense of unreality because the sense of authority is no longer real. Men will not feel that wisdom is authentic if they are asked to

believe that it derives from something which does not seem authentic."

No child wants to lean upon infallibility; no human being does. Just as soon as a child can move for itself, it prefers to do its own moving rather than to be moved by some great power outside itself. As soon as it can crawl, it prefers to crawl rather than to be carried; as soon as it can walk, it wants to let go of the guiding finger and, even though it tumbles and hurts itself, it wants to struggle up again and make another try. If now and then, in fatigue, it wishes to be carried or to lean upon a stronger hand, just as soon as it can recuperate it wants to strike out again for itself. So it vascillates, with the old antinomy of the race, between independence and anchorage, between freedom and infallibility, between personality and authority; but of the two extremes, freedom, independence, personality is far and away the more essential to expanding life.

What is true of the child, who is father to the man, is just as true of the adult mind and soul. There is for it no final source of authority. If these statements are true in the relation of parents and children, how much more true in the relation of husbands and wives. Here there is no room for authority. The word "obey" has no valid place in a marriage ceremony in an age of reason. One personality cannot, in the nature of the case, invade and dominate another, not even with a loving dominance. Live and let live, as partners and equals in the business of life, with courtesy and deference shown as to equals—this is the only livable basis between

human beings; this is the life of reason, the life of freedom, the life of love.

The natural question arises, what about discipline in the home? The natural answer is, why should there be discipline? Discipline implies authority, the imposing of one will upon another, the army spirit. To be sure, if one sees a child about to rush over a cliff one exerts physical force to catch him and draw him back, but one immediately points out the cliff and the danger and reasons with the child. One restrains a child from walking in front of a moving motor car, and accompanies the action with the reason for it which the child can easily understand when it is pointed out to him. It is reason, after all, that should prevail, reason and love. Discipline is the proper word to apply to a regiment rather than to a home. Neither will this attitude produce anarchy among children; nor is it the same as saying, "Do as you please." It is merely the substitution, for the old idea of adult authority, of the newer idea of the reign of reason, of reason and love.

Teachers in our schools talk much about discipline. But our schools are modeled on the Prussian plan; the whole idea of their organization is of Prussian origin. And the trend in education is away from the military ideal and practice just as rapidly as conditions will permit. Reason and love are gradually taking the place of military discipline in the schools; and instead of sitting "in position," eyes to the front, hands folded, feet on the floor if they can reach it, or standing in ranks and rows at attention, children are increasingly allowed to sit round tables, talk if they want to, pass notes if

they wish, and otherwise to act not as if they were on a parade ground, but as if they were in a library or a home. The development of personality without undue repressions and suppressions, this is the slogan of the new mental science, the spirit of the age of reason; and it is having its effect in the production of finer human beings, freer and stronger, leaning upon no canes or crutches of authoritarianism, but standing upright and walking alone.

III. FREEDOM *vs.* AUTHORITY IN BUSINESS AND GOVERNMENT

One day we shall know enough, perhaps, to introduce this principle of reason and love into society at large. Beyond the circle of the home and the school, we may grow into such social beings that we shall be able gradually to apply the law of reason and of love to commercial and industrial relations. There are some signs of it already on the horizon. Men in business often complain that they meet nothing but self-interest and that the only law that prevails in commercial life is the law of the jungle, get or be got; but there is an increasing number of men in business who are trying, and with a fair degree of success, to put into practice the higher law, do as you would be done by. Protestantism may, indeed, be responsible for the system of capitalism and of competition, as perhaps we shall see later in this volume; but in the long run it may be that this same spirit of Protestantism, with its reign of reason and its repudiation of authority, may lead to a higher consummation in business life. Some big business men, like

Arthur Nash, William Hapgood, Edward A. Filene, and a great many others whose names are not so well known, have conducted their business upon the avowed principle of the Golden Rule, the law of reason and of love. And many other big business men are talking, in their better moments, in a wistful sort of way, about a hoped-for time when the competition, the battles, the restrictions, the courts, and even the police systems of the business world may become unnecessary. That time may be far off, but that is the logic of the philosophy that authoritarianism has been tried long enough and found wanting.

Undoubtedly human society, for the most part, up to the present time presents no beautiful picture of loving co-operation. On the contrary, the mob spirit runs riot in it; bitterness, envy, and hate, greed, anger, and bigotry grow thick all round us. People who know nothing of what they are talking about, utter opinions of which they are as certain as if they sat in the seat of the omniscient. The mob can be kindled into a frenzy of fanaticism by an appeal to prejudice, as it was kindled over the question of evolution in Tennessee, and in Texas and Arkansas and Missouri. Uninformed bigots, shouting loudly, can lead the herd after them to deeds of persecution, ostracism, and spiritual martyrdom, as we have seen them do in this present generation; but at least the actual power of physical life and death has been taken out of the hands of the mob, for the most part, and some progress at least has been made toward a reign of reason. The dawn is very faint, but there is a dawn.

The fathers of the American republic, which is an outgrowth of the Protestant spirit and the age of reason, declared and reiterated until it has become a truism with us, that the best government is the least possible amount of government. The nearer a people attain to the development of full personality, the freer and the more grown up they are, the less government they need. It follows that when people have attained to a very high state of personal growth, government may grow beautifully less, almost to the vanishing point. So far the theory. Practice, of course, is quite a different matter, just because no people now on earth are anywhere near grown up, developed, free. With a nation, as with a child, just as rapidly as personality is unfolded, so rapidly may restraints and guardianship be removed. It is truth that sets us free, truth within expanding into personality without. It is always and inevitably true that as one grows he becomes free, even in a world where authority must for the masses still remain in force. It may be that a time will come on earth, possibly a hundred thousand years away, when this ideal of the absence of authority may be realized. A dream? Yes, the dream of Tolstoi, the dream of Jesus, the dream of a kingdom of God. But dreams, dreamed with reason, have a way of coming true.

IV. Should There Be Authority in the Church?

If the home and the school are no places for authority, and, ideally, society no place for it, then surely the church is no place for it. Perhaps Jesus had this in mind

when he suggested to his followers that they should call no man master. It seems as if human beings, so much like sheep scattered abroad, must be organized, institutionalized, headed up by leaders and guides. It seems as if the formation of religious societies with officials is necessary in the present state of human development; but it is something to recognize the existence of a necessary evil, even if one cannot immediately eliminate it. And evils enough are manifest wherever ecclesiasticisms have been strong. Everybody knows instances.

Here is one: The pastor of a large and influential church, twenty-nine years of age, when the world war involved this country, told his bishop that he wanted to volunteer. The bishop told him that he must not go; he was needed at home; he was too great a preacher. But after a mental struggle the powerful young man told his bishop that he was going anyway, and he went. He served as a chaplain, and when he came home no bishop in his denomination in the whole country would give him a pulpit. He was forced into business, a man of rare power on the platform. After eleven years, he is at last in a commanding pulpit in another denomination. The old Roman church would have been much wiser and gentler than that. Its wisdom of the centuries knows how to forgive and to find a niche for every man according to his abilities. Most of us would feel that in this case there was nothing to forgive but only to commend. This example only points out, to be sure, the defective character of human organization; man-made and man-administered authority; but are not all the ecclesiastical authorities man-made and man-admin-

istered? And are they not, therefore, according to the logic of the Protestant mind, to be reduced to the minimum just as rapidly as humanity matures? The less authority in the church, the more nearly it approaches identity with the kingdom of God. Coöperation, equality, the beloved community, reason and love—these are of the essence of the kingdom of God. The only command that the founder of Christianity ever gave was the command to love. He said, "A new commandment give I unto you, that ye love one another." This is the only discipline that he recognized.

Even love may sometimes forget itself and put a heavy pressure where it intends only to put a tender hand. The soft touch of love may rest upon a child's eye or cheek or throat or above his heart and the response may be nothing but a grateful one; but let that touch be prolonged and persistent and the comfort may turn into pain unspeakable, unendurable. Any pressure upon a human soul, the tenderest and the gentlest, if prolonged and insistent, may produce exquisite pain. Human beings, whether in body or in soul, are not meant for constant and unrelenting pressure, even the pressure of love, of mistaken love, which is not really love at all but the self-assertion of the one who thinks he loves. True love never dominates, never enslaves, never holds down and presses down with a steady and relentless hand. True love respects individuality and personality, gives freedom for growth and expression. Love is opposed to authority; and when Jesus commands love, so far from exerting authority, he is removing authority and

saying to the human being, "Be yourself; it is natural to love."

Not even God tries to exercise authority over the free human mind and soul and will. We talk about God's commands, but in reality God makes no commands and never has. The ten commandments that we have ascribed to God are the outgrowth of human experience as to what is wise and just and right between man and his fellow-man. So it is with all our laws. God does not make them; we make them, or, better still, discover them. Hamlet said that "the Everlasting fixed his canon 'gainst self-slaughter"; but the Everlasting did nothing of the kind; the conscience of humanity for about fifteen centuries made the canon against suicide. Before that time, in the Roman empire, and even today in certain quarters of the world, there is nothing blameworthy about self-slaughter. The difference between the attitude that such and such things are God's commands, or God's will, and the attitude that such and such things are best for society, have been tried by human experience and found valuable, is the difference between authoritarianism and the scientific, the Protestant, spirit. Only a comparative few have as yet reached the latter attitude. The great masses, even of Protestants, still cling to the belief in certain fiats of the Almighty, still talk about the death of a loved one as God's will. It seems difficult for them to attain the position of the scientific mind which recognizes all laws as the outgrowth of the nature of things as they are.

Not only does God not give commands, but also man does not make laws. Man only discovers the laws that

already exist. When certain causes operate in nature, certain effects are produced; and this sequence we write down as a law of nature. In the same way, given certain conditions, human beings act toward one another in certain ways; then we write down this sequence and we call it the law, moral or civil. Man does not make the law; he only finds it out. Time was, for example, when polygamy was the wisest thing for humanity; it was necessary rapidly to increase the population or to make good the ravages of war. In other times, polyandry was the law; it was necessary to hold down the population because food was scarce, and therefore most of the girl babies were put out of the way, just a few being retained for the convenience and perpetuation of the tribe. As civilization advanced, and conditions changed, monogamy appeared as the safest and most convenient unit of society; and then humanity endowed monogamy with divine authority. But man found out all these things as most expedient for the conditions in which he was living at the time. No compulsion was upon him except the compulsion of circumstance; no outside will asserted itself to dominate the will of man. His own emergencies, and his own best wisdom, guided him into his actions and his institutions. It has ever been so.

V. RELIGION IS SELF-EXPLORED

In religion, we must each of us walk the lonely road of self-exploration and self-experimentation. What is good for me, what puts me at my best, what exalts and uplifts me, what engenders aspiration within me, that is my religion. Nobody can make it for me; nobody

can give it to me. Someone may kindle it in me by word or action or personal contact, may stimulate me until I react for myself; but the reaction must finally be my own. No matter how much some outside authority may tell me that I ought to think this and believe that, ought to do this or refrain from that, it can do me no good. Only what I can think and believe and do in the fulfillment of my own growth and personality, only that has any meaning for me at all. Outside authority can pour water over my head by the barrelful, but only that water which I drink myself can sustain me, can become part of me. The same is true in regard to truth, goodness, beauty, religion.

As Dean W. R. Inge, of St. Paul's Cathedral, London, so trenchantly observes: "But whereas the Catholic regards the voice of the church as infallible, and not to be questioned without disloyalty, and while the Protestantism of the Reformation period gives much the same absoluteness to the revelation of God's will in the inspired Word, the spirit of Protestantism, when it understands itself, holds that there is no infallible authority anywhere, but that men are educated both by what Dean Church called the gifts of civilization and by the Holy Spirit, whose operations are now often called religious experience. Modern Protestantism gives decidedly greater authority to the internal witnesses, the mystical experience and reason, than to either of the two external guides."

"What, then, am I to believe?" cries some timorous mortal who is afraid to stand alone and to walk alone. The answer of the Protestant mind is clearly: Believe

what you can believe; believe what you can't help but believe; believe what is natural for you to believe. We are all pretty much alike; our minds run in pretty much the same channels. Given equal opportunities, we naturally and easily find our way to the essential truths. It is important, first of all, to believe in oneself. If this age of reason succeeds in persuading large numbers of human beings to believe in themselves, to believe they are of such great value that there is no authority which ought to dominate them, it will have achieved a high purpose for mankind. Then, next, believe in the world, in the order of things, in the reign of law and regularity, in the reasonableness of the universe. Margert Fuller Ossoli cried out, "I accept the universe!" And Thomas Carlyle, when he heard of it, replied, "Gad, she'd better." The rough old philosopher, with his witty reply, did not give sufficient weight to the utterance of a human soul that had really found salvation. It is because some of us do not accept the universe that we make shipwrecks of our lives; it is because others do accept it that they are able to grapple with things as they are, to tackle them as objects in which they not only believe but in which they believe there is a beneficent order. That is the high plane of thought and living to which the modern scientific mind leads us in the end. It is the gift of Protestanism.

CHAPTER V

Protestantism and Business

THERE are those who maintain that Protestantism, if not directly responsible for modern capitalism, at least gave birth to the individualism that rendered our present business system possible. Professor Reinhold Niebuhr, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, says, "Many social thinkers have traced the spiritual affinity between the economic doctrine of *laissez faire,* which the commercial middle classes of the past centuries used as a weapon against the power and privilege of the old aristocracies, and the insistence on liberty in the Reformation. But it has remained for a German sociologist, Max Weber, to prove Protestantism and capitalism in intimate and organic relationship far beyond the individualism which was the spiritual fruit of the one and the moral basis of the other."

It is not easy to define the term "capitalism" because perhaps it may be a thing of degrees. In general, it may be roughly said that capitalism is identified with the idea in business affairs of competition, of "every fellow for himself and the devil take the hindmost"; with the economic doctrine called *laissez faire,* which means that if you let economic forces alone they will take care of themselves and of the people, that laws of supply and demand, of increasing and diminishing returns, like the

laws of nature, are inexorable and beneficent in their working.

This attitude has prevailed in European business unquestioned for the last three or four hundred years. It prevails practically unquestioned in America now; although Europe has grown disillusioned on the subject and has begun vigorously to grapple with these hitherto unassailable ideas. Russia has tumultuously upset the whole capitalistic machine and if she has not replaced it with something totally different, she has at least radically modified it until today she is working under a combination of capitalism, socialism, and communism. The experiment is as yet too new to pass upon. The Labor party in England frankly and profoundly questions, as it has never done before so fully, the whole organization of industry, commerce, and finance under the so-called capitalistic system. The Sydney Webbs, the Bertrand Russells, H. G. Wells, and Bernard Shaw, leading thinkers in English life, are not only discouraged concerning the outlook for the British empire but for moneyed empires of every kind throughout the world. They are groping for something better. In America, however, up to the present time there is no similar dissatisfaction to speak of with the existing order and there are no outstanding leaders carrying banners of revolt.

Whether Protestantism directly gave birth to capitalism is a nice question which R. H. Tawney, in *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism,* does not definitely answer. He traces the practically simultaneous rise of the two, but he does not specifically state, and far less proves, that they stand in the relation of cause and effect. One who

follows his historical research, however, may easily draw conclusions for himself not out of harmony with the strain of thought uttered by Dr. Niebuhr.

I. THE ROMAN CHURCH AND BUSINESS

The Roman church during its long reign of nearly fifteen centuries in Europe certainly taught with overpowering authority the doctrine that the pursuit of gain was to be tolerated, at the best, and never exalted. All business was, in the view of the church, a concession to the imperfection of our earthly state. The ideal of conduct was the renunciation of the world with its occupations, its enjoyments, and its possessions. The ascetic life, if possible the monastic life, withdrawn from the world and without wants which could be supplied by material indulgence, this was the high life. Artisans and traders, farmers, herdsmen, and even artists, were lower orders of vocation than that of the undivided pursuit of religion. Trafficking and trading for gain were at least verbally and overtly discouraged by the church. The lending of money for interest was expressly forbidden and, under the authority of the Old Testament, was labeled with the opprobrious epithet "usury."

To be sure, the church did not herself hesitate to profit by the riches of her adherents. She got her share of the wealth accumulated even in spite of her commandments, Rome in the middle ages was a center of worldly splendor, and all over the western world her rich abbeys, convents, and monasteries flourished on their hilltops and in their glades, with their wide-spreading farmlands and their multitudinous flocks and herds. If her people

would and did not practice what she preached, she would at least accommodate herself to the atmosphere of their lives by taking a share of what they gained by the practices that she did not preach. The church amassed great treasuries, erected magnificent cathedrals, and enthroned her princes in jeweled power by the fruits of the very traffic upon which she frowned.

II. BUSINESS UNDER THE NEW FREEDOM

Then came the Reformation with its liberation of the minds and consciences of men and plunged them into the welter of a chaos of economic thought and behavior. Luther himself never grappled seriously with the problems involved. Impatient and tempestuous, and profoundly concerned with the theological controversies that raged round his heroic head, he seemed unable to center his thought upon the vocational and business effects that the new freedom would have upon the mundane life of the people. His mind really followed the conventional groove of economic theory in which the Roman church had brought him up. He, too, conceded the necessity of worldly occupation, but looked upon it rather as a concession. He, too, denounced the loaning of money for interest as usury. He never thought his way through to the logic of the individualism which he had launched upon the world.

It remained for John Calvin, that intellect of polished steel, to hew out a new economic theory to fit in with the new freedom. He found in New Testament and Old Testament alike and without discrimination, an order of life made up of thrift and industry, coupled with

economy and sobriety, of utter simplicity of living and lack of ostentation no matter how the Lord might prosper the thrifty citizen in his business, that gave the new Protestantism an eye to the main chance which it has never lost. Not only in the Calvinistic churches but in all Protestantism, the philosophy of John Calvin prevails at the present time. The devoted Calvinist does not fail to lay by him in store and also to give tithes of all that he possesses, even while he is avowedly serving a master who commanded, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth" and added, "A man's life consists not in the abundance of things that he possesses." Like John Calvin, the Protestant world thinks more in terms of Paul of Tarsus than of Jesus of Nazareth. The freedom of the individual from authority, the right to work and to trade as he pleases, if not imparted by the Reformation, was at least tremendously increased by it; and the result is the existing system, the reign of *laissez faire* or everybody for himself, the prevailing competition with all its rewards and failures, which we have come to call capitalism.

Whether Protestantism caused the system of business under which we live or only aided and abetted it in its growth, nevertheless the prevailing religion of the western world tolerates capitalism; indeed, stands helpless and disarmed in the presence of its overmastering power. Protestantism up to now has thrown up its hands and not only accepted the situation but made terms with the gigantic cohorts of business. The captains of industry, commerce, and finance, many of them, are prominent in the councils of the church; they are donors of huge sums

for ecclesiastical and charitable purposes. It has been declared that they salve more or less uneasy consciences by these donations to the Lord. The religious leaders of Protestant churches refrain from uttering their convictions on economic questions, or conveniently shape their convictions to the atmosphere in which they are placed, rather than run the risk of alienating the barons of business. Perhaps here lies the secret of the loss of power of those churches which are in the majority in the trading nations. Perhaps here is the secret of "waning Protestantism," as it is boldly called in certain quarters, the dwindling attendance upon its services, the increasing difficulties of its treasuries, and the loosening grip upon those even nominally its members, particularly the young. Perhaps if Protestantism should find a new, or rather an old, courage to declare without controversy and without shilly-shallying the ethics of Jesus as its foundation, it might regain its hold upon an economic world which at present is undoubtedly like a flock of sheep scattered abroad without a shepherd.

III. PROTESTANTISM AND LAISSEZ FAIRE

Protestant leaders, however, both clerics and professors, have joined forces with the worn-out doctrines of the Adam Smith school of competitive business, and have declared the teachings of Jesus, the Sermon on the Mount and the Golden Rule, inapplicable and impossible in business as well as in politics. It is safe to say that most religious teachers in the western world, to say nothing of laymen officials in Protestant churches, would assert without hesitation that Jesus was no more

a sociologist or economist than he was a historian; that his utterances upon business relations constituted a counsel of perfection which perhaps even he did not expect to see taken literally; that the non-resistance to evil which he enjoined was an ideal to be held high before us but very high, even out of sight; that a society without law courts and with a community of goods is all very well to contemplate as a Utopia like that of Plato or More but not to be thought of as realizable. This is a fair interpretation, perhaps, of the attitude of mind of most ministers and religious teachers in the Protestant churches. They all speak highly of Jesus, declare their loyalty to him, and believe in their own loyalty; but when it comes to putting his ethics into business relations, they do not even think seriously about the possibility.

Professor Harry F. Ward, however, in all his books, and particularly in *Our Economic Morality,* shows most vividly the flaws and the dangers in our business world due to the very fact that we neglect to take literally the ethical and social teachings of Christ. He finds that the very sources of our economic system, springing from the so-called enlightened selfishness of Adam Smith and Ricardo and Malthus, are the three principles which are accepted as axioms in the business and social life of America. These three are: Competition in business as the life of trade; business life and practically all other activity for profit; and as the end of these two, the possession of property. Professor Ward has only to point out to us that these three are entirely out of harmony with the

ethics of Jesus to convince the open mind of the truth of his assertions.

Competition has grown so acute in our business life that even cool, hard-headed business men are reaching the conclusion that somehow it must be eliminated so far as possible. We find great leaders talking about supplanting it with co-operation. Their method of co-operation, so far as it appears, seems to be the method of consolidation, the merger, the putting out of business completely of the small competitor by means of huge combinations, chain stores, chain newspapers, chains of every kind. The perfectly evident result of these measures is the concentration of wealth and power into fewer and fewer hands and the increase of unemployment and of breadlines. Two-thirds of the wealth of America, as is well known, is in the hands of one-third of the population. Ninety-nine per cent of all the people in the country have incomes under nine thousand dollars, most of them very much under. There is over-production and under-consumption, which amply proves two things: first, that there are not markets enough available to absorb the products of our massed industry; and, second, that many of our people, if not most of them, are unable to obtain and consume their share. This intense and unlimited competition worked very well so long as we had a continent of practically unlimited resources not yet developed; then there was room at the top and all the way up; any young man could aspire to become President of the United States or president of a railway or a newspaper owner or a captain of industry; but with a continent increasingly denuded of forests and mines,

with so much of the oil already drained off or in process of being drained off, with capital more and more concentrated and passed on from father to son, there is not near the chance now to go west and grow up with the country. Young men cannot so easily escape from the class into which they were born and mount the ladder to a higher one.

IV. A NEW ETHICS IN BUSINESS

Some industrial and commercial leaders begin to grasp these conditions and to offer tentative solutions. Edward A. Filene, of Boston, owner of a great department store, and a Jewish citizen of eminence, has written a book called *The Way Out,* by which title he means the way out of this intense competition. He prescribes four steps which he thinks industry must voluntarily take: first, raising wages to the highest possible point; second, decreasing the price of the products to the consumer; third, mass production; and, fourth, democratization of industry. Mr. Ford, the most successful manufacturer, perhaps, on this continent, has adopted three of these four principles to a greater or less degree; he has not adopted the fourth—he is still an autocrat in industry—but he is only about sixty-five and maybe there is hope for him yet. Anyway, dim glimmerings are coming into the minds of great business men that the competitive system under which we are living is not all that it ought to be, is not safe, leads to dangers within the country and without. The unlimited competition for world markets which hitherto has prevailed is one sure cause of any future wars now looming on the international horizon.

Statesmen of the western world are convinced that civilization cannot stand another war; they are making desperate efforts to avoid it, but they honestly don't know how. Some have suggested the ethic of Jesus as the only way out; but few take them seriously, perhaps least of all Protestant preachers and teachers.

Within our own nation, the vast machine of competition grinds many to powder right under our eyes. Here is a man fifty-two, still able-bodied, bright, and intelligent. He has been fifteen years a mechanic in a great factory, with excellent wages; but the efficiency expert from a distant city walks through and says to the superintendent, "Too many old faces and gray hairs," and out goes the old mechanic. No pension system, no reward of long and faithful service; just squeezed dry and thrown away. This is the story of thousands under the competitive system. Or here is a young man, sensitive, artistic by nature, who ought never to be a business man at all, fitted for only one thing, to be an artist or musician, but in the great machine there is no room and no reward for artists and musicians; the circumstances of our social life organized for business only ring him round like steel and crush him out. Thousands of those who squeeze themselves into the great machine lead only half-hearted, unfilled lives, never happy because they can never do the thing they love to do; they drag along, dispirited, often hopeless; they eat and breed and die, and never live. There is too much business, so much more than any of us need, too much production, and we cannot limit it under the existing order. Maybe Christ knew what he was talking about when he propounded

his ideas of simple and careless living, doing the things we love to do, without thought for the morrow and for moth-eaten and rust-consumed treasures laid up that we cannot take with us into our untimely graves. If Protestantism would only preach that and, what is more, live that, it might not wane. Perhaps Russia may yet succeed in working it out.

Modern governments, as governments, begin to comprehend that unchecked competition among them for commercial advantages, for markets, and for raw materials like oil, cannot stop short of another world war. This dawning comprehension is set forth so plainly by John Bakeless in *The Origin of the Next War* that the reader cannot help but see it. Most commercial nations do not want the next war, for they understand that it will bring them loss and not gain. Nevertheless a nation is always ready to fight if it thinks it can make anything by fighting; and there are one or two governments in the western world which seem to be getting ready to take the chance; if they do, of course they will embroil the rest of the world. It remains true, however, that most governments are now well convinced that war does not pay. Within these nations, competition works just the same havoc as war works among them; and when business leaders begin to understand this fact as clearly as governments are coming to understand it, they may gradually accomplish a peaceful revolution. Up to the present time, in America at least, there seems to be so little comprehension of this simple truth as to amount to none; and the few who have begun dimly to grasp it

seem powerless to evade the intensity of the strife, except through merger and monopoly.

V. MODERN MOTIVES IN BUSINESS

The motive behind our business system is plainly profit. Men are not in business for their health, they frequently assert, nor for anybody else's benefit. According to the ethics of Jesus, they ought to be in business for both. The question today in the minds of most men who enter a life-work is, "How well will it pay?" The question is not, "How best can I spend my life? How can I grow best? How can I benefit the world most?" The question baldly and frankly is, "How can I make most?" Even those who enter the occupations which are evidently for the service and the well-being of their fellow-men catch the same infection and are moved by the same motive. The physician, in spite of himself, for the most part selects the specialty that will pay best and carries it on in the fashion that will prove to him most lucrative. The artist draws in the style which will bring him the best returns, even sacrificing his ideals to the common end. The literary man writes what he thinks will be a best seller, and his eye is constantly on the royalties. Attorneys choose that kind of practice, preferably with big corporations, which will bring them the fattest fees. Even ministers will move from one parish to another at a higher bid. One of them refuses to be elected bishop, naïvely declaring, "Why should I be bishop? I can make a thousand a year more where I am."

One constantly hears the statement made, in comment upon a proposed piece of work for some young man,

"There's good money in that," or "There's nothing in that. You can't make money there." A young woman marries well if she marries a man who is making money; hers is a bad match if she marries one who is not "doing well," which means making money. A young man or an old one is "successful" according to his profits. That these observations are so trite is demonstration of the universal state of mind which they betray; they are so commonplace as to excite no surprise. The surprising thing is that such an atmosphere can prevail solidly throughout America without exciting remonstrance and protest. The protests are all reserved, both by his wife and his community, for the man whose life is given not to profits but to any other aim in the world. The wife of Andrea del Sarto, who kept him from becoming the equal of Raphael by her constant insistence that he should make profits for her, is multiplied thousands of times in our modern America; and not only that, the whole of society takes the same point of view as the wife of that prostituted artist. Many fine souls are ground to powder between the millstones of the profit motives of their day and country. No more really was the young man of Nazareth nailed upon a wooden cross than is many a young American immolated upon the cross of steel behind our machine-made civilization. Had they lived in the Florence or the Rome of the Renaissance, or in the Athens of Pericles, a niche and room would have been found for them, in which they could live with all their sensitiveness, their delicacy, and their courage, and grow and work for something finer than the universal demand that they show profits. Not measuring up,

according to the iron rule of profit production, they consider themselves failures in life and either sink down in despair, effortless, or voluntarily take their departure.

The end kept in view under this competition for profits is, of course, the accumulation of property. Nothing raises such a storm of loyalty and fanatical defense in American life as the slightest question concerning the sacredness of property. To question the sacredness of human life itself is scarcely so great a heresy. "Who steals my purse steals trash," makes no hit at all with the American mind; my purse is very far from trash; my purse and my property are guaranteed, if you please, by the constitution and by all the inviolable usages and habits of mind of my nation; my government will all but die for my purse and my property. Yet the question, which has raised its head in liberal England and elsewhere in the civilized world, will not down even here in America, "Just how sacred is property? Just how much right has anybody to inherit the accumulations of his father? Just how much has society at large aided in amassing that property and how much has society at large the right to share in the enjoyment of it?" Society makes the center of a city, the people help to build the property values of the lots; how much has any individual the right to profit by the mere accident, even the actual forethought, of the ownership of those lots? A department store or a drugstore may pay a heavy dividend, thirty to a hundred per cent; the people make valuable the location of that shop; how much right have the owners and the operators, with all their business acumen and efficiency, to the rolled-up profits of the

years? These questions are pressing for serious consideration and for attempts to answer.

Property is power, power over the lives of others. Property enables the holders to sit back at leisure and demand the services of others, their toil and sweat, in the form of rents and interest. In other words, property makes some men masters of other men; it is a form of serfdom or slavery. We say that slavery has been abolished in the civilized world; it has not. What shall be said of the increasing idleness and futility of many inheritors of wealth? What shall we do with and for the great army of toilers who, by their efforts, maintain these sons of American nobility at Newport and Palm Beach? Plainly, this condition of affairs is non-Christian, utterly out of harmony with the sociology of Jesus.

Then, too, there is growing up in America a stratification of society, a division into classes approaching the rigidity of hereditary rank in England and the European nations. The basis for this division into classes in this country is property and property alone. The very wealthy in the east mimic the ways and manners of living, and the attitudes toward others, their so-called inferiors, their serfs, that obtain in the nations descended from feudalism. We have our barons, earls, and dukes on American soil. This spirit and these attempts at a little aristocracy are evident even in the smaller cities across our continent. The heirs of wealth will not mingle with the rest of the people, will not send their children to the same schools, will not even attend the same churches. How far have we departed from the democratic

ideals and utterances of the founders of the republic? And how much farther have we gone from the ethics of Jesus?

VI. FAMILY ETHICS IN BUSINESS

The ideal which Jesus taught and lived was the ideal of a kingdom of God, a beloved community, all men free and equal, all men children of God; in other words, his ideal is that the ethics of the family should be broadened to apply to all human relationships. In the family we try to let love prevail, courtesy, consideration, unselfishness; and the family is successful according to the prevalence of love and kindness; it is unsuccessful according to their absence. This, Jesus considers to be the touchstone in all society, in business, in government, in every social relation. One needs but to state this fact to appreciate the rarefied atmosphere in which he lived and breathed and thought. It is too high for us; we cannot attain it; like Simon Peter, we fall to our knees and say, "Depart from me, O Lord, for I am a sinful man." One who attempted to apply the family attitude in a grocery business, a department store, or the manufacturing of any article, might just as well throw himself to a hungry pack of wolves or into a cage of Bengal tigers. Self-preservation would not permit, in the existing order of society, any such useless martyrdom. Ask any common-sensed heir of property, small or great, "Why don't you sell it and give it to the poor, and go about teaching the ethics of Jesus?" and he would reply, "It would get nowhere. It would be dashing my brains out against the

stone wall of modern social organization. I can do much more wisely by expending my income or my property in teaching as widely as possible the ethics of the Nazarene."

Here is the solution, as in most other matters: education, evolution to prevent revolution, the gradual unfolding of the kingdom of God, leaven working in the lump, insistence line by line, precept by precept, here a little, there a little, the way of the prophets, the way of the Master himself. Wherever an ocular demonstration is possible, make it. Teach by example; teach in the concrete. Men are doing it, the late Arthur Nash and his factory, William Hapgood and his, Edward A. Filene and his department store. They are teaching it, not simply by welfare enterprises, club rooms, restaurants, music, gymnasia, and baths tacked on to the industrial plant; but they are teaching it by the attempt to practice the Golden Rule with employees, customers, competitors, and those from whom they buy their raw materials. It is often a very nice question as to how to employ the Golden Rule in this or that transaction, this or that relation in business; but where the will is to practice it, there the way can always be found. The slow process of education, how impatient we get when it is proposed! The trouble is, God is not in a hurry and we are. We want instantaneous changes made, upsets of the existing order suddenly brought about, revolution. We declare that the holders of property never yet have yielded it except to force; yes, they have, to the force of education, slow, creeping, titanic. Public opinion is the most powerful

force in the world; and only public opinion will hold a nation in leash, or a nobility, or a propertied class. Education is the way out, the continued and increasing chorus of prophets, drilling into the stone, steadily boring away until the time comes when the structure of the social order shall disintegrate and change as rocks under the operation of ice and snow.

"Saints are still born among us," writes Will Durant in *Mansions of Philosophy*, "kindly men meet us at every turn, modest girls can be found if we like to find them, patient mothers hide in a thousand homes, and heroism rivals crime in the daily press. A flood comes, and a thousand people go to help, and a million men contribute financial aid. A nation starves, and her enemies succor her. Explorers are lost, and others give their lives to rescue them. No one has yet fathomed man's potentialities for good. Behind our chaos, our riot, and our crime lies the fundamental kindliness of the human soul. It waits till the riot is over, and another moral order emerges by trial and error to lift it to nobility. The old world is dead; long live the new!"

The world a big family, supplying its need in the spirit of self-help and help of others, freed of competition, working not for profit and profit alone; finding it unnecessary to pile up mountains of property, mountains of bread, with which to command armies of men; radiant good will toward everybody; all humanity a beloved community; every house a house by the side of the road where dwells a friend to men; all the nations living and helping others to live, exchanging works of

art and of the creative mind—what a picture it is, what a millennial age, no wonder Jesus called it the kingdom of God. No less than that is the dream that we may dream about the future. No less beautiful than that is the aim that Jesus holds up to us. When we begin to work toward it, we shall start up a long hill indeed, but what is time to God?

CHAPTER VI

Denominationalism

INEVITABLY freedom of thought, the individualism that sprang from the Reformation, resulted in the division of the Protestant world into scores and even hundreds of denominations. Differing types of mind and differing trains of thought demanded different styles of worship and organization. One type desired a rich liturgical service, another a severely plain Puritanical sort. Every new prophet that arose gave a color to the thought and life of his followers which separated them from the rest of the religious world. Each sect, as it arose, undertook to restore the apostolic type of church and each claimed that it had been successful; so that there seem to be just about as many apostolic churches as there are sects. Some of them even set out to unite all the denominations into one church, their own church, with the ensuing futility of adding only one more denomination.

Denominations are like disease germs, sects are like streptococci; they must serve some purpose, but the Lord only knows what it is. So far as our limited vision goes, they cause only trouble in the world. They are a condition that confronts us, a defect in the order of things, a handicap to labor under, and not an end to be promoted.

I. SECTS UNIVERSAL AND PERPLEXING

Sects we have always had with us, like the poor, and shall always have. They take their root from the diversity of human nature and they will never disappear until human nature changes its leopard spots. Human beings are so constituted that they can never see truth and right all from the same angle, nor see all of the truth and the right; but what they do see, they all think is the whole. One flash of light, on one side of the mountain, and they insist they have seen the mountain and know it all. One swift view of the sea, from only one point on cape or shore line, and they feel they comprehend the ocean. "That settles it. I know all the truth, for have I not seen it? Wisdom will die with me." That is the age-long song of poor, little, purblind man.

The Jews had sects—and for the matter of that still have them—just as the Christians had. Before Jesus came, they had their Pharisees and Sadducees and Essenes and various other "nees." They had their Ebionites and Nazarites, and various other "ites." The Greeks and Romans had their Stoics and Epicureans, their Platonists and Neo-Platonists; the Brahmans of India, long before Christianity was born, were split up into scores of sects now known only to the scholars, and they are still split up. Ancient Buddhism and ancient Confucianism, far older than the Christian era, likewise knew their denominations. Even politics knows them. How many political parties are there in America? And how many in each of the other nations? And how many people do not find their views expressed by any political party or

by any religious denomination? Humanity varies infinitely, and doubtless always will.

The Lord might have left disease germs out of the world; but if he had, perhaps humanity would have multiplied so fast as to overrun the place, and he would have had to find some other way to kill them off and make room for others. He might have made us all alike, so that we would see the truth and right alike; but if he had, life would have been much less interesting and spicy. We can, then, understand why denominations exist, even while feeling that they are an unmitigated evil, a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet us. They are the underbrush that we've got to stumble through, the thick wilderness that somehow we must overcome, the handicap and the obstacle that we must struggle with and overcome. The condition confronts us; with the theory we are not greatly concerned.

The troubles caused by sects are so apparent that one needs scarcely to rehearse them. We have divided councils, pulling and hauling at each other, with little forward motion and the generation of much heat. Like an army or an expedition or a migration without unified command, we scatter, criss-cross each other's trail, pass by the most important places, and wind up far apart, at fault, lost, futile. We waste force and dissipate funds. Then we duplicate, several parties grabbing at once for the same points of settlement. The heart-breaking sight is so common we have become calloused—six denominational churches in a town of six hundred and a seventh one moving in because, it says, "There is no real Christian church in the place. We must go and start one that

is Simon pure." Six untrained, bigoted, little preachers, or only three, or none at all; and any there may chance to be, miserably supported, without books, without contacts with the world, absorbed in the petty village fights and jealousies between sect and sect. The denominational mission boards, meantime, pouring their funds and sending their absentee-supported emissaries into the "field" to hold up their particular colored light, red, green, yellow, in the darkness as if it were a "heathen" land—and heathen it is, to be sure. Then in this heathen village the church workers, the guilds and ladies' aids, miserable little handfuls, spend their time backbiting, envying, hating each other, while the real men of the place are sick of the whole thing.

In larger places, you may see four churches on four corners of the courthouse square, where two or one were amply sufficient. In big cities you may see a dozen churches in a half-mile square where two or three great cathedrals, with a plural ministry, might gather in and care for all the people ten times more efficiently. You may see each congregation trying to take members away from the others; you may see ministers jealous of each other, making unkind remarks about each other, envying and sometimes even hating each other, when they should be pulling together to try to bring men and women under the influence of a common Lord, trying to alleviate the sorrows and the distresses and solve the problems of the people who cannot fail to see the division and the hostility so easy to behold. There is nothing Christian about it. It is worse than pagan.

Why not do away with it, then? Easy enough to

say. Why not do away with human nature, with its one-angled view of truth and right? Anybody who thinks at all recognizes the evils of sectarianism and its few or no benefits. We realize, to be sure, that differing types of mind, because of their heredity or their training, may desire differing emphasis on truth, differing form and ceremonial, differing atmospheres of worship; but at the same time we recognize that all these might be provided under a unified church as well as a divided one. Why, then, not get together?

II. OBSTACLES TO UNITY

The obstacles seem insurmountable. In America, the major denominations have lost all real differences. A stranger might wander into a Methodist or a Congregationalist or a Presbyterian church and, unless he were very acute and keen indeed, be unable to tell to what denomination this particular church belonged. Most of us, supposed to be expert in church doctrines and affairs, cannot for the life of us tell the differences between certain of the denominations; and if we should state those differences, they would seem to this age altogether petty, insignificant, and outworn. Surely it would be a simple matter for such denominations to merge into one? But not so fast! What about the vested interests? There are the land titles dating way back; there are the centralized missionary organizations with their officials, presidents, secretaries, and treasurers, with their bequests and their annuities. There is always a way, you say, to solve the problems of propertied interests where there is the will; but there remains the inertia of human kind,

the desire to continue doing things as they have always been done, the ruts and the channels. How are you going to get out of them? Then each denomination has its ways and its manners, its deep-seated traditions, its very vocabulary, all meaningless to the others. It has its pride of opinion, its perfect confidence that "We are the people. We know the truth and the right. Wisdom is ours beyond anybody else's, and it will die with us." We may not put it in such bald terms, but that is the spirit of each sect. No, there is no hope in your day or in mine, if ever, of any large measure of actual union among the one hundred and fifty different denominations in the United States.

Denominationalism is an expensive luxury and by no means a necessity. Protestantism could very well get along without it and be much better off. As a matter of fact, if Protestantism keeps on indulging it, Protestantism will go bankrupt. The sooner we look the situation squarely in the face, take account of stock, cut down overhead, provide necessities and dispense with luxuries, the better we shall be able to handle the real problems of our life, such as social adjustments and industrial difficulties, with which the church has to grapple.

The tendency towards this luxury springs from the very constitution of human nature. The assertion of the ego, the desire to exalt the self and to vaunt ourselves, poor little creatures that we are, and so in need of bolstering up, lies at the very basis of it. No matter how conscious we are of our own vanity, we nevertheless constantly cater to it by forming little cliques and companies, little clubs, even little pairs, and looking with

condescension, or even cutting criticism, at the rest of the world, and saying to ourselves, "We are the people. Wisdom shall die with us." Too often we indulge the luxury all alone; and then it is another case of "little Jack Horner in the corner." The tendency toward denominationalism, sectism, religious, political, social, is almost irresistible in us all. We form our clubs and associations, our lodges and our churches, and deliberately foster the feeling of superiority, pronounce the shibboleths, hold up the standards, or wave the flags, as the case may be, because it makes us feel big and because everybody else suffers in comparison with our own little selves and our own little crowds, our own little sect, political party, or nation. To become conscious of the egoism that underlies all this may help us a little bit, may it not, to shake free from the enervating effects of this day-dreaming luxury.

Another inherent characteristic of humanity which leads directly into this slough of luxury is the inertia of the human mind and will. We love to find a place, settle into it, and refuse to leave it. Few of us have the daring to hunt for "a better 'ole." It is a delightful thing to lie down and sleep in the same place all the time. Cats and human beings both love to do it. Few of us have the exploring instinct of the hound, hound of heaven or hound of earth; and even if by chance we do, we want to come back home when the hunt is over and lie down in the same old kennel. "It always has been done this way; my father always did it this way; and what was good enough for the fathers is good enough for me." The regular track, the same old rut, the same

form and ceremonial, the same organization and usage, the same, the same, the same—this universal desire is one of the trunk roots of denominational luxury.

Closely allied, a twin root indeed, strikes deep down into our nature and that is unwillingness to think. "Let me alone, my mind is made up; too much trouble to unmake it and make it all over again; what's the use of changing; costs effort to change and it is so luxurious to settle back with all questions solved and finished." Almost irresistible is the desire of the mind to come to rest, peace, sleep, the folding of the hands in sleep; and we are so impatient of these pestiferous fellows who will not leave us alone but are constantly jabbing and stabbing at us to try to make us wake up and think. What's the use? When we were thirty or thirty-five, we settled that question once and for all, now why reopen it? We crystallize and fossilize in our middle years, at the very top of our powers, and we don't like to break the crystaline shell or the fossiliferous case in which we lie. "Let us alone; we've got the truth, the final truth, sealed, signed and delivered." This is the luxury of belonging to the denomination that is nonpareil, eighteen carat, Simon pure, the old Jerusalem gospel, unspeakable luxury!

No matter how narrow and restricted and barren the poor little field in which we are penned, it is the whole luxurious world to us. A goat is satisfied in the back yard where he is immured, covered with straw, stunted shrubs, and tin cans. A sow is satisfied in a muddy sty, belly deep in mud. Beautiful language, this? Well it is a beautiful thing I am talking about. I have seen many

a goatish sectarian, chewing upon succulent straws and twigs and tin cans, his beard wagging and his self-satisfied eye in a fine frenzy rolling; perfectly assured that his little pen is the whole universe, contains all the sustenance as well as the scenic grandeur that any sane goat ought to desire. "We are the people" bawls the goat, lost in his luxury. And I have seen many a sectarian sow grunting in self content, and growling at any intruder, rolling little bead-like eyes in the delusion that she sees the whole big round world, mud from head to heals, wallowing in mud, in the luxury of her limitations. If this is rough language, I would call your attention to the fact that St. Paul uses rougher. No, the luxury of denominationalism is not an admirable thing calling for dainty and fragrant description; it is a dirty and vicious thing calling for all the vituperation that our English will bear.

III. UNLOVELY FRUITAGE OF THE SECTS

Look what effects it produces, what unlovely shapes it grows. It is the mother of snobbery, exclusive and not inclusive. There are several kinds of snobs, financial snobs who high-hat everybody that does not possess just so many millions or thousands; social snobs who ostracize everybody who is not in a certain little hereditary or customary circle; and religious snobs who look down upon all people not of their own particular stripe and color; and of all these snobs, the worst and most childish is the religious snob, the furthest away, if possible, from the spirit of the inclusive Christ. He never tried to shut anybody out; not even the worst denominationalists of

his day, the Pharisees. He tried to draw everybody in, even Samaritans, the heretics of the time, even street-walkers, the social outcasts of his day and ours, even the tax-collectors, the one class of men most cordially hated. If we ever catch the spirit of Christ, we shall find no exclusiveness, doctrinal, social or other, in our veins or our mental fibre.

Once more this luxury divides and does not unite, centripetal, not centrifugal. It drives people apart, throws them off, when of all things else we need to draw together. In fact, in the stress of modern life we are already drawn together, jammed together, in the concentration of our increasingly complex social structure. All the less can we afford to try to kick away from others with whom we are willy-nilly in such close contact. We need uniting forces, not dividing ones; we need altruism and not more assertion of the ego; we have got to learn to live together, closely and harmoniously, or else die like flies, morally and spiritually die. Today above all others in history is the day for union of Christian people or else a day of doom for them. They can take their choice of maintaining the old luxury of their denominationalism or of inheriting the doom of what we call our Christian civilization.

It is easy to see, then, how expensive and not economical is this luxury, as all luxuries are. The very word implies useless expense; to keep up this luxury we sacrifice necessity. It is foolhardy to do a thing like that, although people are constantly doing it in their private lives. The churches are no wiser than the improvident poor to whom they so often condescend and whom

they so often chide for buying the things they do not need instead of saving up for the things they seriously do need. Take the lesson home, ye churches, to yourselves. Keep on with the luxury of your eight-cylindered denominationalism and find yourselves by and by unable to make repairs and to move at all.

It goes without saying that this luxury spells no spirituality, but the height of unspirituality. The satisfied sectarian whines and harps upon his particular type of song and form of prayer, with his particular holy tone, and calls himself spiritual; when all the time he is giving the finest possible demonstration of what Jesus denounced as unspiritual, the broadening of phylacteries, the long-winded praying in public places and the showy giving of charity where everybody could see. It has been my experience that the narrower the denominationalist, the more he profaned that beautiful word, spirituality, and the less he knows about it. To him all that is true and beautiful and good, lovely and of good report, are seen only with half an eye, and that a jaundiced one and out of focus, because all the intensity of his vision is centered upon the unimportant and the restrictive fences of his little pen.

IV. SIGNS OF HOPE

Is there another side to the picture? This much, that all those large minded enough are trying to fulfill the prayer of our Lord, "That they all may be one," by working together as much as possible and pulling apart as little as possible; that the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America commands the allegiance of nearly

all Protestants nationally, and state and city federations locally; that as many co-operative movements as possible are fostered by the denominations, or at least by those leaders in denominations, gentle and sweet spirited enough, strong and brave enough, brotherly and Christ-like enough, to range themselves side by side, instead of toe to toe. Weekday schools of religion, Christmas and Easter union services, united efforts of all kinds—these are multiplying in the larger centers and spreading even to smaller ones.

A further sign of hope is coming up over the horizon. More and more individual churches, regardless of denomination, are becoming community churches. Their denominational bonds grow more and more tenuous and less and less emphasized. These churches reduce the body of required doctrine to the lowest possible terms, the belief in Jesus as the Christ, Son of God and Son of Man, and the will to serve and follow him. If any creed is recited in these churches, it is only as an ancient symbol, a ceremonial, valued only for its flavor of tradition and its atmosphere of worship. No actual and formal assent is required as if it were a scientific formula. In these community churches the day for such theologizing has gone by. The recognized essence of the Christian faith, common to all denominations, alone is demanded of the membership—allegiance to Jesus. The right to define all terms for himself is left to the individual.

Along with this minimum of belief goes the minimum of required form. The two sacraments of the church, upon which all are in general agreed, baptism and the Lord's Supper, are administered by such form

and at such time as the individual may himself determine. The forms and ceremonials of public worship, ritual and liturgy, emerge from the cultural environment and heritage of the people making up the community church. Whatever is adapted to their minds and spirits is adopted into the forms and service of the community church.

Free trade in members is the order between such churches. Letters of commendation or statements of membership pass at their face value. There is no protective tariff on the interchange of church members; there are no immigration laws, no educational nor doctrinal tests for admission. In some quarters this is called open-membership. It has been practiced a long time by some churches, but only newly adopted by some others. The point is, that it is an increasing practice, that the number of these undenominational, free, or community churches, is increasing in all quarters of the land. Naturally, these community churches thrill and throb with alertness to the spirit of the times, to the emergence of new truth, to the adoption of new measures. They are fully conscious that the essence of the Christian faith remains the same from age to age, that Jesus is the same, yesterday, today and forever; but they also recognize that new lights are turned upon him and upon his teaching from generation to generation and century to century, that knowledge grows from more to more and with it more of reverence may dwell in us all. So they are out for everything new and true, everything beautiful and good. These churches do not fight the rising tide of increasing truth but try to ride higher upon it.

Why should these free churches not cut loose from their old denominations entirely and become wholly independent? Some day perhaps they will, and in that line may lie the path of real Christian unity. It is too soon, however, for most of such churches to sever entirely their old denominational ties. The number of avowed community churches, with no denominational tie at all, and now bound together in an association, is something over sixteen hundred; but this movement is not yet powerful enough to render it safe for certain churches, already community churches in everything else but name, to shake themselves free from the denominational entanglements in which they were born and in which they have lived. After all, humanity is gregarious. We cannot flock alone. No church can develop or grow, scarcely even survive, that strikes out by itself on an entirely independent course. The experience of such churches has been that they have floated along more or less precariously during the life and activity of some more or less brilliant leader and then have broken up and sunk beneath the waves. For efficiency and for permanency there must exist ties with other churches, solidarity, community of interest, fellowship in effort and inspiration. These may all be present, however, with a decreasing emphasis upon denominational aims and purposes, slogans and doctrines, properties and organizations. An increasing number of churches in great cities, consciously or unconsciously, are plunging ahead upon this course. The outstanding churches in most cities grow less and less denominational and are more and more to be de-

fined as community churches. This comes nearest to a rainbow of anything that hangs in the Protestant sky.

Denominationalism, due to the diversity of humanity, inherited and environmental; denominationalism, as old as humanity and religion, an apparently unmixed evil and yet apparently unavoidable, may gradually disappear or at least diminish in importance with the passage of the centuries. The evils of divided councils, wasted resources, duplication and overlapping, with the resultant rivalries and jealousies and hatreds, may at least be mitigated. The obstacles to unity, such as vested interests, pride in tradition and opinion, the sluggishness and inertia of humanity may never be done away with, but at least they may be diminished by the rise of the community church. The increasing number of great churches, great both in numbers and in spirit, which reduce doctrine to its lowest terms, with a firm faith in Jesus as the Christ alone; which lay upon the shoulders of their people the smallest possible burden of required form; which freely interchange their members: and which keep an open face turned always toward the light —such churches go far toward the fulfillment of the prayer of Jesus for unity.

CHAPTER VII

Protestantism and Woman

"THE female of the species is more deadly than the male"—even so late as Mr. Kipling this idea, though not always spoken, has more or less unconsciously swayed the minds of men and therefore influenced their attitudes toward women. The belief of primitive peoples in *mana,* or magic,—a belief that mystical causes are more powerful than material; for example, that people do not die of a cold wind or of eating poisonous food but that they die of witchcraft, the evil eye, some spell or charm—has influenced humanity all down through the centuries and influences us unconsciously to this day.

Under this system of belief woman was regarded by savage peoples as dangerous, the repository of *mana,* the very center of magic spells, and her presence in the community, indispensable as it was, constituted a continuous threat of calamity. The origin of this idea is more or less obscure but can be at least partly understood when we remember the intense fascination that woman has for man and has ever had. Whatever is so attractive, whatever cannot be resisted, may easily be regarded as dangerous. The basilisk's eye, in our old legendry, is a case in point; the common idea that a snake can charm a bird is another. Again, to the primitive mind, blood always signals danger, for it is life itself. Many ancient

peoples would eat no meat until the blood had been thoroughly drained away. This was a regulation under the Hebrew laws and, as the fifteenth chapter of Acts clearly shows, extended down into Christian times. Whenever blood appeared, human beings were frightened; so they were afraid of their women in childbirth and at other periodic seasons.

So dangerous did many savage people consider their women to be, that they avoided all contacts before hunting expeditions or before war. The whale could not be successfully harpooned by a man who had just left his wife; his hand would tremble; his eye would not be sure. The antelope, the elephant, the tiger, would surely fail to fall before the arrows of the hunter who any time within a certain period had been with his woman or women. Moreover, unless her conduct at home, in the hut, the tepee, or the kraal, was above reproach, the warrior or the hunter might fail, might fall in the battle or the hunt. She must observe certain definite restrictions, avoid certain taboos, carry on a prescribed ritual, to ward off the dangers of her *mana* from her absent man.

That this superstition survived long after tribes had become pastoral and even agricultural is perfectly clear from the laws of Israel as set down in the Old Testament. Women who bore a child had to go through days and even weeks of so-called "purification" with accompanying sacrifices and ceremonials, after the birth of the child, a longer period for a girl child than for a boy child. Similar observances had to be followed after her monthly experience of the "way of women." The origin

of these observances is rooted in the barbaric idea of *mana,* of the danger of womankind.

The weird rites of marriage among primitive tribes are traceable to this fear of woman. All kinds of spells and charms were woven to protect the bridegroom against the dangers of his newly wedded wife. Loud noises were made to scare away the evil spirits; the bride might be beaten by the other women, bruised and lacerated, to chastise away the evil magic that inhered in her. Sometimes the bridegroom would not be allowed to stay in the same room or hut with his bride the first night, or for many nights, but a younger brother or little lad took his place until the danger might be overpassed. Some of these ancient forms survive at the present day in the marriage ceremonials of highly ritualistic churches even in the Christian religion.

In view of the danger which for so many millenniums men have been inclined to ascribe to their women, it is not surprising that medicine men, witch doctors, and priests led the way in prescribing charms and taboos to be raised against this magic. The same attitude of open or unconscious hostility to the normalcy and the freedom of women has been assumed by modern religious leaders charged with the preservation of social and religious institutions. The church, in a great deal of its history, has fought the liberties of women, and down to the present time keeps up the fight in one form or another. It may not be always conscious that the thing it is fighting is the barbarian *mana,* but that is what it is. We have inherited it for thousands of years; it is

in the blood, in the very texture of our being, none the less there because we are not aware of it.

I. SURVIVALS OF THIS ANCIENT FEAR

In this essential fact lies the root, it would seem, of the age-long misunderstanding and antagonism of the sexes about which we hear so much. Civilization has always been a man's civilization. Man has been the ruler, not merely on account of his superior physical strength and his supposed mental strength, but also because of the intense fear with which he has regarded woman and his desperate determination to guard against her dangers. Woman frequently, for purposes of her own, has been willing to fall in with the legends of her danger and even to foster them. There is no intelligent and scientific reason for this age-long antagonism between the two sexes. Biology is proving to us beyond all peradventure the essential partnership of the sexes, recognizing the essential differences, to be sure, which nature herself has decreed, but no rational ground for hostility, fear, and opposition. The biological difference between sperm cells and the ovum lies at the base of the difference between the sexes and runs all the way down through the history of the two and all the way out to the remotest nerve and muscle and channel of the blood stream. Every gland, whether endocrine or not, adds to this essential and constitutional difference between the two, which are not hostile but complemental in the biological structure and in the life; the one only supplements and completes the other. One is not superior and the other inferior, either in body or in mind; they

are just totally different. This modern scientific conclusion has been reached by the few, surprisingly few; but we have been a long time reaching it; and the dregs of the old fears and taboos, the old spells and charms with their implications, are with us and in us still.

A curious survival, that has come down to us, of the rites and ceremonials springing from the fear of women is found in the eating of fish on Friday as a sacred observance. Fish do not copulate to produce young. The mother-fish lays her eggs or spawn and the male swims over them until they are impregnated. Savages, with their age-long fear of the sex-relation, before going into battle or going hunting would live for days upon a fish diet, to keep themselves free from the *mana,* the taboo. Sex-contact was regarded as unclean—ceremonially unclean—impure, taboo. Hence grew up the verbal usage which persists to this hour: pure and impure, clean and unclean, being still used of a relation which is essentially no different as to cleanliness from eating or from a score of other bodily processes.

The advocates of feminism of recent years have made the mistake of insisting that the only difference between men and women are due to differences in environment, education, and opportunity, covering thousands of years. Their case would be strengthened if they both comprehended and freely admitted the marked biological difference between the sexes; and their strategy would be far wiser and more effective.

Gina Lombroso, a doctor of laws and doctor of medicine, in *The Soul of Woman,* drawing a sharp distinction between the traits of women and those of men,

guards carefully the truth that this distinction is not hard and fast, that the dividing line between the two is a wavering line, that to all rules there are many exceptions, and that many women possess certain masculine traits to greater or less degree and many men possess more or less accentuated feminine traits. She makes a strong point of her generalization that woman is by nature alterocentrist while man is egocentrist; that is, woman's life hinges on persons and things outside herself; it is always some one or some group, some thing or things, upon which her destiny and happiness depend; while man is self-sufficient, absorbed with what is inside of him, his desires, aims, thoughts, and achievements. This distinction maintains not merely in the human race but throughout all creation as between the masculine and the feminine. It is necessary. If the feminine creature did not thus center her life upon things outside of herself, the species would not be perpetuated. If, on the contrary, the male were not absorbed with the field and the chase, his prowess and his ability, the young of the species would not survive.

II. CHRISTIANITY AND WOMAN

Now comes the question: What part has the Christian religion played in the long drama of adjustment through the ages? It is an easy thing, as many do, to make the sweeping generalization that all religions and priesthoods, rooted and grounded in superstitions of all kinds, have enslaved the physically weaker women and abetted the lordship of men. Like all such generalizations, this one, at various points and various times, breaks down.

It is undoubtedly true that Paul, the most influential of Christian writers in the apostolic age, cherished the prejudices which grew out of the superstitions that gave rise to the Mosaic code of social laws. The fear of woman, and her supposed danger, is evident in these statutes. Moreover, the tenth commandment, carried over with the rest into the unwritten constitution of the church, classed women along with chattels, cattle, and other possessions which one should never covet. Paul, therefore, a lawyer by inheritance and training, enjoined upon women, even in the Gentile church, many of the restrictions observed under the Jewish law. She was not to appear uncovered as to head and face in public places; she was not to speak in the congregation; she was to live her life withdrawn, secluded, and in every way according to that baneful adjective "modest." Believing as Paul did, especially in his earlier career, in the second coming of Christ and the end of the world in the very near future, he advised against marriage. He did, however, conceive that in some instances of intense passion it was "better to marry than to burn"; and he did advise that husbands and wives already married should render to each other "due benevolence"; but at the same time he reminded wives that they should obey their husbands.

In the apostolic age, therefore, the lot of woman appears to have been none too enviable. The attitude of Jesus, the founder of the religion, was undoubtedly obscured by the utterances of the apostle to the Gentiles which were earlier accessible to the newly founded churches. The Christian consciousness had not yet

grasped, perhaps has not even yet grasped, the liberality, the kindliness, the respect, and the penetration with which the man of Nazareth treated all women with whom he came into contact. Too much emphasis, perhaps, has been laid upon the one single utterance of Jesus about divorce for one cause only—perhaps a quick, offhand utterance at that—and not enough emphasis upon his actions which speak louder than his words. His treatment of his mother, of the woman at the well of Samaria, of Mary and Martha, the sisters of Lazarus, of the weeping Mary with the long hair, of Mary Magdalene, of the woman in the temple, in fact all the women who circled round him, is the kind of treatment that, when it becomes universal, will mark the highest reach of the social solution of this eternal question.

The attitude of the Roman church, covering so many centuries, and expressed by so many church fathers, needs little elucidation. Founded partly upon the Jewish tradition of subordination, partly upon that of Greece and then of Rome, and influenced to a profound degree by the utterances of Paul, it looked upon woman as a source of danger to man and placed her in as much seclusion and subordination as it possibly could. Under the Jewish law, woman had always been a commodity to be bought and sold, to be owned like a piece of property, to be put away at the will of the husband, unable to inherit, unable to testify in a court of law except by consent of her male relatives. At the height of Greek supremacy, woman was regarded only as a producer of children; she lived in the back of the house

and the men in the front; she never ate with men or associated with them in conversation, in business, or in politics. Men spent their lives, the greatest of them, like Socrates and Plato, like the artists, poets, and dramatists, in men's associations. No wonder Xantippe, the wife of Socrates, scolded vehemently. The only women with whom Greek men ever conversed on anything like equal intellectual terms were the famous courtesans, like Aspasia. Roman women, subject to the same legal disabilities as the Jewish, had occasional periods of freedom and influence under the empire; they sometimes amounted to something in political life and councils; but on the whole they occupied the subordinate position common to all the ancient civilizations.

The Roman church inherited much of this classic attitude and carried the tradition of subjection for women down into the middle ages. The women were immured in the castles while the men went away to fight. The peasant class, happier by far than the chatelaines, could toil in the fields and carry on the farms in the absence of the fighting men. The supposed romance of the age of chivalry did not greatly illumine the lives of women, for they did not interest their knights as much as horses and dogs and deer did. The women of the castles and even of the fields, like the women of Athens, served as mothers of future soldiers and that was about all. The highest life for a soldier of the middle ages was an ascetic life, perhaps a monastic life, a templar's career, never for a moment forgetful of the danger of womankind, and tolerating women at the best as a necessary evil in an imperfect world.

III. THE REFORMATION AFFECTS WOMAN

The Rennaissance and the Reformation, bursting upon the world almost simultaneously, possibly one the cause of the other to greater or less degree, inevitably shook old customs and old relations to the very foundation, among these, the relations of the sexes. Under Protestantism the clergy took wives and established homes, led by Luther and imitated by all his followers. The same individualism which let loose the forces of trade and commerce and launched modern capitalism among men in this new age of revolt set free from much of their bondage the soul of women. During the Elizabethan era in England, women became as learned as men. Many in the Virgin Queen's court could speak five or six modern languages, to say nothing of the possession of some knowledge of Latin and of Greek. Elizabeth herself led them in the new fashion. Under the Stuarts there came a marked retrogression, culminating in the debauchery of women under the restoration of Charles II, in which backswing of the pendulum we see the often marked fact that human progress comes in waves and recessions, forward strongly and then back part of the way. The impetus that woman's freedom and equality of mind received under Elizabeth has never quite been lost. The effect of it, although counteracted by certain hostile forces, can undoubtedly be felt in the feminist movement of our own time.

Not only was woman dragged backward and downward by the dissolute court life of the restoration of Prince Charlie, but also by the powerful Puritan move-

ment, colored by Old Testament legalism and literalism. Puritan women, counseled and compelled to the utmost sobriety of dress and conduct, repressed, suppressed, all but effaced as to personality and charm, fared little better than their sisters of the tents of Israel or the harems of the Moslem world. If a woman walked abroad at all in Puritanism, she must walk with her eyes upon the ground, her hands folded piously before her; if she spoke, it must be ever in low and hushed tones, without free expression of mind or spirit; if she laughed, it must be a soundless and a mirthless smile, without exuberance, without abandon. In such a school of repression were reared the women who came to America and became the mothers of at least the New England half of the colonial people. Here is a swing back of the pendulum as extreme as that of the gay and dissolute era of the reign of the Stuarts.

Another epoch of enslavement of women, perhaps the direct outgrowth of the Puritan movement, Queen Victoria's long reign brought about in the lives not merely of English women but also of American and other women as well. During the Victorian era women worked either too little or too much, according to where they stood in the social scale. At the top, the women of quality did nothing but sit in drawing rooms and turn loose their tongues; hands must be folded and soft, never soiled with work; constitutions must be delicate, never robust; if a woman had good health, she was to conceal it carefully for fear the men, who liked them pale and interesting, might be alienated. The ladies depicted by Jane Austen must be proper, repressed, modest

beyond endurance, with sense and sensibility, with pride and prejudice, clothed most modestly; for, as a wise physician of the times counseled his daughters, charms concealed and skilfully suggested were far more alluring than charms revealed. Much of the Victorian influence still shows itself clearly in the twentieth century and in the democratic atmosphere of old England and new America. Simultaneously, among the lower classes in English life women were burdened and overburdened with work, in mines, factories, and fields. At the same time that they were attempting to rear families of children, they pushed coal carts, like asses, along the galleries under ground; they were under-fed, improperly housed, and lived short and miserable lives, the serfs and slaves of Miss Austen's dainty daughters of the drawing room. Thus at neither end of the social scale did the Victorian woman enjoy any measure of equality of opportunity with men.

IV. THE MODERN WOMAN

The feminist movement preceding and accompanying the world war struck many shackles from the hands and feet of women. The individualism launched upon the world at the Renaissance and the Reformation could not long be thrust into the background so far as one whole half of the human race is concerned. Political freedom came like an avalanche into democratic nations at the conclusion of the world conflict. A measure of economic freedom came too, but only a measure; complete independence for woman in industrial and commercial life has not yet been won. Social freedom is

following hard, but that too trails behind the political advance. The battle is going on; the chaos is extreme; the ultimate result no man can foresee. The principal battle grounds, as at present the war for feminine freedom appears, are Russia and America: one socialistic, even communistic; the other, capitalistic. In both, women are winning the strife, and liberty is as sure to be theirs as the sun to rise tomorrow morning.

Even the measure of economic freedom accorded to women, the opportunity to work in factories, stores, and offices, and therefore to support themselves in whole or in part, has produced startling changes in social life and structure. Increased divorce, fewer children, added independence, pleasure-seeking, insistence upon a single standard of morals and customs—all these and many other symptoms of profound unrest have followed upon the heels of the economic liberation of women, limited though it be, from home industry and farm industry, and their entrance into wider fields. Shallow thinkers may reiterate that dancing, cigarettes, automobiles, short dresses, bobbed hair, cosmetics, the aftermath of the war, cabarets, gin, and what not, are the causes of our social upheaval—and who has not heard the cocksure utterance of such conclusions from pulpit, press, platform, and Pullman smoking room, in wearisome platitude? But however easy and comfortable these supposed explanations to the shallow-pated, they are wide of the mark, far wide; the real cause of the unrest, the change, the chaos, is economic emancipation, even incomplete economic freedom, the industrial revolution still going forward in the machine age.

This one thing seems certain, that when the period of complete emancipation comes women will have neither too much work nor too little; they will be neither too burdened for complete development of personality nor too idle for happiness. For it is true beyond peradventure that woman shall earn her happiness in the sweat of her face. She can never be free, and she can never be happy, unless she is active, useful, serviceable to the society of which she is a part. To keep women in idleness is but the policy of the harem, the diplomacy of men who wish to hold women in subjection. This policy seems doomed to fail, so great a force has been let loose in the new individualism of woman. Now that she is free to range, she will find work for her hands to do, mother's work, wife's work, teacher's work, employee's work, manager's work, welfare work, politician's work—all kinds of work she is determined to undertake, and what force is there powerful enough to stop her?

Political freedom she has won, and a measure of economic freedom. Spiritual freedom she is determined to win; she will first define it and then go about to get it. In spiritual freedom she will include not only all the literary and artistic pursuits upon which she is already entering, but also social and moral initiative, liberty, and equality. Already, indeed, she is grasping at this higher independence, in the rarefied atmosphere which is above and beyond the more material relationships.

What the end is to be, what man has the temerity to forecast? There are those who believe that the end is to be a woman's world, that the tables of ten thousand years' standing are to be overturned, that man who has

been so long in the ascendant is destined to find himself soon subordinate. This is the prophecy of John Langdon-Davies in *A Short History of Women,* the concluding paragraph of which reads: "Seeing that, as Chaucer said, women seem to desire domination, and seeing that few men are happy until they get some one else to take over from them their will and their liberty of action, perhaps the world will be happier in the new régime. But all this is of only partial value as speculation on the future; for men and women are purely relative terms, and long before the tendencies of our time work to their logical conclusions, men and women, as we know them, will have ceased to exist; and human nature will have forgotten the 'he and she.' According to our own personal feelings we may regret that we shall not live to see that time, or congratulate ourselves on living at a time which antedates it." The assertion of Tolstoi was that already the period of women's dominance has arrived. He said: "Where is her power! Everywhere and in everything! Go past the shops in any large town. The amount of labor there stored is beyond compute—uncounted millions; but see whether in nine-tenths of those shops there is anything for men's use? All the luxury of life is wanted and kept up by women. Count up all the factories. An immense part of them produce useless ornaments, vehicles, furniture, and trifles, for women. Millions of people, generations of toilers, perish, working like galley-slaves in the factories, only to satisfy her caprice. Women, like queens, hold nine-tenths of the human race in slavery and hard-labor. And all because women have been degraded and deprived of

their equal right! So they revenge themselves by acting on our sensuality, and snaring us in their net. Yes, it all comes to that." Professor Ramsey Traquair, of McGill University, Toronto, writes an article called "The Regiment of Women," in the *Atlantic Monthly* of March, 1929, to which he gives the subtitle "a plea for equal rights for men in America." He says such daring things as this: "Today woman never hesitates to break a convention and never permits man to do so, for the unconventional woman is a brave creature, defying the lightning, whereas the unconventional man is an outcast." He holds that in America men are all dominated and bossed by women, have their noses to the grindstone to support women in their social, intellectual, and recreational life, with the greatest ease to women. The result is that men do not know half so much as the women and do not have half so good a time. He is for putting on a revolution to give men a fair chance in the world.

The whole matter of the status of woman, when the logic of the Reformation shall have worked itself out, resolves itself into the ethics of the beloved community, of the kingdom of God, of the family spirit in all relationships of society. That one single utterance of Jesus regarding divorce—possibly merely a quick adaptation to the prevailing prejudice of this time which he did not dare seriously to combat—will be overshadowed by the whole spirit of his teaching and his action, which is the spirit of courtesy, of respect for personalities, of the Golden Rule, and the beatitudes. To him there was no discrimination among genders, classes, ages, distinctions

of any kind. To him all human beings were personalities of highest value. To him nobody was rich or poor, young or old, male or female. Every individual was a sacred person. The Reformation, when complete, will share his valuation of a human being and erect his standards of social conduct. The society or the individual that puts into practice the ethics of Jesus in all personal relations will certainly give to women, as to all others, equal rights and opportunities. We may well anticipate a time, then, when neither the men nor the women shall be in the ascendant, but when they shall live and work side by side, aiding each other, supplementing each other, fulfilling each other.

CHAPTER VIII

Protestantism and the Family

THERE can be no doubt, even to the most casual observer, that the family has greatly changed in recent centuries and is rapidly changing at the present time. This appears even more markedly in America than in Europe, except in Russia. America is young, new, experimental, and, in more ways than one, Protestant. Furthermore, the United States has changed almost overnight from a rural to an urban people, from agricultural to industrial and commercial life. The results to the basic social unit, the family, cannot but be revolutionary.

The individualism let loose upon the world by the Reformation, while shaping and reshaping all other forms of authority, likewise has shaken the patriarchal authority which formerly resided in the home. The Pope, or "papa," is not the only father who has felt the earthquake. This same individualism which inaugurated what is called the industrial revolution, the introduction of the factory and the machine-age, has changed completely the modes of living in the majority of households all over the western world. Time was when the home was the industrial unit, when food was grown and prepared by the family alone, when cloth was woven, clothes made, hides tanned, and shoes manufactured, all within the family circle. The home was a little factory, making and doing everything essential to its independent

existence. It could live isolated from all the rest of the world well nigh from year's end to year's end. To such an institution every child was an asset and never a liability, if only it was healthy. Whether boy or girl, every child added one more pair of hands for the production of the necessaries of life. Children were so much added wealth. This type of family life prevailed in America almost within the memory of some of us now living and certainly within the memories of our fathers and mothers. Where is it now?

They say that this family factory still exists in certain sections of old Spain, but it is scarcely found elsewhere even among the peasantry of other European peoples unless it be the Russians. It is the old patriarchal family handed down from the beginnings of history, even from the times when, as some wag has observed, "Adam and Eve raised Cain." Such a family was, and perhaps had to be a despotism. The father was the head. In rare instances, among aboriginal peoples, the family circled round the mother or matriarch; but for the most part the patriarchal family prevailed among the progenitors of our race. When population was sparse and the multiplication of children was greatly to be desired, polygamy in one form or another obtained. The tendency, however, throughout all human history has been toward the monogamous family. This same tendency, biologists tell us, prevails among the higher species of animals. The natural desire of the higher creatures is toward the single mate for life. Departures from this instinctive tendency may therefore be attributed to unusual emergencies, like those of pioneer or pastoral life, sparsely settled coun-

tries, and the need for more fighting men. The knowledge of this innate desire of the human species for the monogamous union brings comfort to the hearts of any who may be distressed about present abberations in our relationships, due perhaps to the over-emphasis of the new individualism.

I. THE CHANGING FAMILY

In what condition now does the family, particularly the American family, find itself? Some say it is disappearing and already has all but disappeared. One observes that we have to have annually a "Mother's Day" to remind us that we have mothers at all. Families have removed from the farm house to the industrial centers for work, for bread and circuses. Nearly everybody in the family now works, in factories, stores, and offices; and if nearly every family owns an automobile, it is often used to take the wife to one factory and the husband to another. Housekeeping and child-rearing, reduced to the lowest possible terms, is accomplished, after a fashion, before and after the hours of work. Father and mother may see the children a few minutes in the early morning or in the evening, and again they may not; hired substitutes often take the place of parental influences. Every child has now become a liability instead of an asset, and the number of them is therefore reduced to the lowest limit. Housekeeping is now done by electricity, by pressing a button here and another one there. Ready-cooked foods come in from the delicatessen and the family table, if any, has become a miniature cafeteria. As children grow up, they scatter to school or

factories, to evening dates or duties, and the family meets more rarely still.

Space is at a premium in proportion to the congestion of population; so the family, like the ancient cliff dwellers, lives prevailingly in flats, crypts, holes in the wall, with attendant dangers, difficulties, and handicaps to health, to morals, and to normal living easy to imagine and not necessary to describe. That this picture is not overdrawn may seem unbelievable to the more well-to-do and privileged classes, but it will be quickly recognized as an understatement rather than an overstatement by any whose work has led them into the thickly populated sections of great cities. Even those families with somewhat better environment and opportunities lead lives conforming somewhat to the pattern set by the fashion of the day. The apartments may be a bit bigger, the delicatessen supplies a bit more liberal, the electrical housekeeping machines a bit more numerous and efficient; there may be two automobiles instead of one; but the general picture remains the same, only brighter. Manufacture of the necessities of life has been taken out of the home; woman's work has been taken away from the home to the factory, to the office, to the shop. "A woman's sphere is the home," has become a laughing absurdity. Unless she is a writer, an artist, a musician, or a piece worker of some kind, which of course is exceptional, she cannot for the life of her find more than an hour's work in the average little apartment in the day.

Under the present régime of highly developed individualism, Protestantism against all kinds of authority,

patriarchal and otherwise, the present-day woman, if she does not have to work to balance the family budget, finds little to occupy idle hands. She goes to a round of bridge parties and teas until she gets sick of it. Perhaps she makes a try at golf or tennis. If she has some intellectual ability and educational background, she may find diversion and profit in the more serious work of women's clubs; she may even find the equivalent of a career in their studies and their attempts to reform and remake the world. For the most part, however, the leisured class of women in the present era are hard put to it to find congenial and saving activities. The idle brain is still the workshop of that ancient and estimable gentleman who is traditionally responsible for so much of the sixes and sevens of this world.

II. EXPERIMENTS TO MEET THE CHANGE

It is easy to see, from this rapid résumé of the changing family, into what a tangle of questions and difficulties, into what a chaos social, economic, moral and religious, present-day society is projected. It is little wonder that our time has been characterized by the phrase "individualism running amuck"; that it is marked by numerous and increasing divorces; that children get extravagant ideas of what they ought to have and be, and resort frequently to highwaymen's methods of attaining their ends; that families are growing smaller; that many, in the great apartment houses of the great industrial centers, are living without benefit of clergy. The time is frankly revolutionary, experimental, changing and Protestant. It is useless to sigh for the

good old days, and the old family fireside. Those days are gone, and the hearthstone has been turned into a steam radiator.

Nevertheless, so intelligent a student as Professor W. F. Ogburn, of the University of Chicago, sums up the situation in these words: "I believe that it is quite possible, even probable, that the family will emerge a more harmonious institution, though such an end is hardly conceivable to those whose eyes are turned backward." He sees in the future a family founded not upon economic production, and the necessities of home manufacture, but founded upon affection and affection alone. He believes, and with justification it would appear, that family affection is ineradicable in the human heart; it is instinctive with us to love our own, husbands and wives, parents and children. Driven by the centrifugal forces of an industrial and individualistic period, we may fly apart for a time in an avowedly experimental era; but the innate desires of human beings are for rest and peace in the affections of the family group. It is not convenience only upon which the unit of social life is built, but it is founded upon the deepest and profoundest instincts and longings of the human soul. That the most free-minded scientists should reach such conclusions ought to give heart of hope to those of us who may be apprehensive that our most cherished institutions and traditions are crumbling away. There need be no real fear for monogamy and the monogamous family; it is here to stay; it will never be outgrown nor replaced. However it may be threatened and temporarily even shattered by the titanic social forces which have followed

the industrial revolution, it is too deeply rooted in the essential soil of the human spirit ever to be torn loose and destroyed.

Rooted is the right word. Dean W. R. Inge, in his little volume *Protestantism,* has made an investigation of the various elements of liberty, spiritual awareness, individualism, faith, humanitarianism, and clear reasoning, which have contributed to the "tree-like" structure of Protestantism. The simile is sound, for as in forest growth the lower branches die off, so with Protestantism; many of its earlier expressions have lived out their day and become but dead wood or branch scars, on the stalwart main trunk of the still growing tree. Professor George Santayana, of Harvard, is quoted as saying that Protestantism has not yet fully found itself, but is still in the making. And Santayana can never be thought of as a propagandist, an advocate, or anything but a calm and detached philosopher.

III. INCREASING DIVORCE

The heavy increase in divorce follows inevitably from these changed conditions in the industrial order and in the scientific, Protestant age of reason. In America particularly divorces have so multiplied that something like one marriage out of seven ends in this way; while in many cities half the marriages eventuate in divorce. According to the Roman Catholic conception, this state of affairs is altogether anarchic; and one or two of the Protestant sects still hold to the same view. Divorce for them is either never justifiable or permissible only for the so-called scriptural reason contained in the famous utter-

ance of Jesus upon the subject. Most religious leaders, even in other Protestant bodies, still influenced by these traditional attitudes toward divorce, inveigh against the existing situation in the frequently used phrases, "the divorce evil," "the orgy of divorce," "the divorce menace," and similar utterances. The students of the social sciences, however, untinctured by these prejudices, and approaching the subject with open minds, seem to hold that divorce is rather a symptom than a disease, that it is the inevitable result of the industrial and economic conditions of the present age, that it is an index to the increased freedom and independence of women, and that on the whole it is probably a passing phase of a painful readjustment.

The utter change from the old-fashioned home, with its internal industries, with its hearthstones and its family table, its hymns and its prayers, to the modern institution which sometimes is like a dormitory combined with a short-order lunch room, has created such a pressure of congested living conditions upon husbands and wives as to render their living together in harmony, peace, and ease a great deal more delicate and difficult. Add to this the ability of women to make their own way in the world, their dread of additional children lest they should make industrial life difficult or impossible, all the additional frictions which this dread implies, and the unwillingness of women to endure what they used to take as a matter of course or of necessity, cruelty, abuse, domination, drunkenness, gambling, and a thousand and one other incompatibilities in their mates, and you have a situation that all the preaching and denunci-

ation of religious leaders cannot affect. The increase in divorces, so far from being mere lawlessness on the part of the American people, springs directly from the changed economic order under which we are living. Far the majority of divorces are secured by women; and that in itself is enough to tell the tale.

We are rapidly learning from the relentless investigations of scientific men that the causes of divorce are rooted more deeply than we used to think. In the opinion of the most expert sexologists, physical maladjustments of husbands and wives, due largely to inadequate and abnormal education when they were quite small, produce more divorces than economic or any other kind of causes. This condition can only be remedied by beginning with the children of the present day and giving them the freest and most scientific training, answering all their questions honestly as soon as they are ready to ask them, and banishing all of the old sense of shame and guilt which has so long hung like a pall over matters that should be treated just as sanely and scientifically as proper food, proper baths, and proper hours of sleep.

Increasingly do students of child training believe that, in extreme instances, divorce is better for children than a condition of strained relations, quarrels, and recriminations, or even repressed anger and restrained hatred between parents. A child is so sensitive that you do not need to quarrel in its presence for it to be aware of such strained relations, and so sensitive that its life may be bent and twisted irreparably by subjection to the strain. Unfortunate as it may be for any child to be deprived of either parent, still it is better oftentimes to be under

the harmonious control of just one than the inharmonious control of two.

IV. "CURES" FOR DIVORCE

The various cures for the so-called "divorce evil," if one must cling to the old theological terminology, such as more difficult divorce or easier divorce, more difficult entrance into matrimony or easier entrance, uniform divorce laws among the states or federal legislation upon the subject, all these can never go to the root of the matter. You cannot treat a symptom with any success without eradicating the disease. The disease in this instance lies deep in the economic structure, the organized forms of industrial and commercial life. Legislation about marriage and divorce will not cut to the root of the true causes. Declaiming against "the disgrace of divorce" and preaching to people that they must bear and forbear, kiss each other good morning and good-bye, and establish family prayer, can never alter the living conditions in modern apartment life. The question is bigger and deeper than any one of these poultices or counter-irritants which are so easy to prescribe for the body politic and which can do so little good. The masses of the people, experimenting with new ways of living, must gradually work out their own solutions, aided and abetted by the best guidance that men of science can give and that education in human living can slowly provide. Time is of the essence of the solution, time and experience and education in the very fundamentals of human relationships.

One of the fields of education rendered inevitable by

changed living conditions in the scientific era and made possible by the Protestant spirit is the field of family limitation. The masses of the people have taken this matter into their own hands in spite of ecclesiastical opposition and hostility. The Malthusian theory, that the world can easily become too thickly populated for the food supply which the earth can produce, has never been successfully combated nor conclusively contradicted, although it is now over a century old. Whether the masses have got hold of this truth or not, they are nevertheless blindly and gropingly working at the problem for themselves. Whether they are aware that the population of the earth may become too big or not they realize that it is very easy for a single family to grow too big for the food supply, or at least the luxury supply, that it can provide; so they are setting to work in their own bungling fashion to prevent the over-population of their own little world. In spite of them, we are told, the total number of inhabitants of the world has doubled in the last century; and, as Francis Bacon said, "It never troubles the wolf how many the sheep be." Most western nations have set to work deliberately to avert the danger to their own food supplies. Only a few whose policy is plainly imperialistic are now fostering an unlimited birth rate. Italy is the outstanding instance in the west, and Japan in the east. These nations at the present time evidently intend to fight if necessary for outlets for increasing population; and since they want to be prepared with an indefinite amount of cannon fodder, they legislate strictly against any limitation of the birth rate.

Most other nations, apparently undesirous of war, seek to keep their populations more nearly at a level. France has done this for centuries and other European nations are now following her guidance. Holland is the shining example of a nation whose government gives instruction in family limitation and eugenics, with the result that in a generation her population has rather increased than decreased, to a healthy degree, since the death rate has been lowered with the birth rate; and some authorities say that the actual stature of the Dutch people is two or three inches taller than it was before. Wherever the birth rate is controlled the death rate automatically lowers, and wherever the birth rate is unrestricted the death rate rises with equal steps. In previous centuries, when the saturation point of population was approximated, immediately famine, pestilence, or war took care of the situation by sweeping out of existence multitudes of people; but medical and surgical science, together with agricultural skill and better transportation, has done away with two of these means of decreasing the population. War still remains as a last resort, and will undoubtedly be the result if nations do not voluntarily limit their birth rate.

V. AMERICA AND BIRTH CONTROL

Is America, then, one of the imperialistic nations, like Italy and Japan, which are looking forward to wars and conquests and which, therefore, desire an unrestricted birth rate to provide cannon fodder? So far as our legislation is concerned, it would appear that we belong in this category. The Anthony Comstock law, a federal

statute, passed in 1873, remains unrepealed. It renders unlawful any instruction designed to limit population. Many of the states have similar laws. In practice, the people, regardless of their religious affiliations and training, ignore these laws. The better educated and more well-to-do classes in particular are able to avail themselves of the knowledge which filters out, in sub-rosa fashion, from the offices of scientific men. The less educated and the less well off must perforce do without such information; and therefore these so-called lower orders multiply more rapidly than the higher ones. The surreptitious, hit-and-miss manner in which the American people as a whole are handling this problem, nullifying their own laws, cannot but be degrading morally and unskilful scientifically. A vast amount of the unrest in domestic relations is due to this intolerable condition. It is a realm in which the Protestant spirit has not yet won a victory, but is still under the domination of unenlightened and outworn theological legalism.

Why are these old statutes not repealed? Perhaps the innate inertia of the human mind bears part of the guilt; perhaps the age-old determination of the male to keep the female in subjection is partly responsible; but perhaps plain ignorance of scientific laws and of economic and social needs is the chief cause of all. Education does not always make an individual better or happier; but certainly the lack of education in the delicate and artistic relations of domestic life does make people a vast deal worse and very much unhappier. It is information, education, guidance in the most elementary principles of

building and preserving a family which the American people needs more than any other one thing to contribute to its happiness. The dissipation of ancient prejudice, the abolition of old taboos, the letting in of light into dark and forbidden corners in which there is no real reason for darkness and for forbidden ground, this the Protestant spirit yet must undertake to accomplish.

Concerning the rights of mothers to decide when they will have children and when they will not, Professor Edward M. East, of Harvard University, in his book *Mankind at the Crossroads* has this to say: "If there is not full freedom, it seems as if both mother and child are being defrauded of a reasonable chance for life and health, hindered in their liberty of action, and restrained from the pursuit of happiness. I now realize what an unsophisticated person a biologist can be who puts his trust in rational formulas and natural laws instead of the dogmas of old folkways. One sees communications from doctors, lawyers, and captains of industry who most assuredly do not accept such a statement as axiomatic. In fact the idea strikes them as carrying within it a terrible menace to society in some mysterious way. They fear for the consequences if women are permitted to depart from the ways of their jungle ancestors, and to bring forth children by choice as thinking beings. To him who carries this feeling as a relic of the timidity which led men to fear to allow women to read, to hold property, to vote, or otherwise to assume a full partnership in life, one may say with Solomon: 'The foolishness of fools is folly.' If it be a case of anxiety about the

disappearance of the human race, one must exercise indulgence, and recommend a course in elementary biology."

That the American people may be unconsciously imperialistic in aim and may be preparing to conquer or defend markets in quarters of the earth beyond its boundaries is not at all unthinkable; on the contrary, it is a suggestion which the nation may do well to ponder. It is difficult to answer the question whether America cherishes such purposes or not. Nations are not always nor often conscious of where they are going even while they are on the way. Someone has said wittily and a bit cynically that America is the least military and the most warlike nation in the world. Is it true? We have certainly grown and spread, by one means and another, until without doubt we are today a great empire, the most powerful in the world. We began with a little strip of territory on the Atlantic coast and we pushed our way by conquest, peaceful penetration, and purchase clear to the Pacific coast, down to the borders of Mexico, into the Caribbean, to the Isthmus of Panama, northwestward to Alaska, out to Hawaii and the Philippines; and where are we going to stop? Possibly the trend of our history and our far-flung trade lines at this hour, feeling out for markets in which to sell our surplus goods and sources from which to draw our raw materials, oil, rubber, metals, and chemicals, may have some influence, none the less real for being unconscious, upon our desire for unlimited man power. Who is wise enough to solve this question?

VI. GOOD RESULTS FROM CHANGED FAMILY

One desirable result comes from the diminished power of the patriarchal family ideal in the Protestant world, and that is the lessened domination over the individual of the old-time family. The patriarchal discipline, maintained for so many centuries in family life, undoubtedly led to many untoward results. The father complexes and mother fixations, beginning to be so well known since the popularization of the new psychology, are by no means idle dreams. The loss of individuality, the discouragements, the twisted and aborted lives, the actual neuroses frequently traceable to this inexorable pressure of the family are plainly to be seen by the trained eye in our vicinity at the present time. Many an employee is hesitant and afraid in the presence of his superior and does not know that the origin of his timidity lies far back in his early years when an iron-handed father or mother bent and broke his will. Many a confirmed bachelor or bachelor maid, if only they were aware of the facts, could trace their condition to mistaken love and oversight resulting in tremendous pressure upon their young and tender lives. Older people, almost in spite of themselves and all unconsciously, are inclined to impose their personalities and their wills upon younger ones; it seems next to impossible to go back in imagination, renew one's youth, and put oneself in the child's place. The adult is so sure that he knows better than the child, that he insists upon all behavior being adult behavior like his own. Even the tenderest love and solicitude may and does often err upon the side of undue influence

exerted upon the growing life, and although the hand that exerts pressure is a gentle hand, none the less the tender sprout may be easily bent aside. It is extremely difficult, even for those trained to scientific pursuits, to measure the tremendous influence of family pressure, an influence that is felt and manifested through the whole span of human life. We never recover from our families. It may be, then, that those centrifugal forces which are lessening the immediate central pressure upon individuals in our changed industrial age may not be unmixed evils; they may indeed be blessings in disguise, throwing the young outward from the nest, to light on their own feet, to shift more for themselves, to build independent lives and strong individual personalities.

On the whole, the picture of family life drawn by the most careful investigators in this industrial period shows many high lights far from discouraging. These scientists seem to believe that the family is a long way from dying out, that no set of conditions can ever stamp it out, that society has made no mistake in its search thousands of years long for a unit, in lighting upon the family, the monogamous family at that, as the final even though the imperfect integer round which human organization builds itself and will continue so to do. So does the human heart, in its inevitable loneliness, yearn for intimate contacts, affections, blood ties, that it will forever cleave by irresistible attraction to those nearest at hand. The long helpless infancy of the human young makes imperative the unremitting care of those responsible for its coming into the world. No institution, however good, can take the place of the family, one would almost

say, however bad. Social workers prefer as a rearing place for the child a very imperfect home to any perfect institution. After all, it is love that makes the world go round; affection is bread and water to the hungry and thirsty soul of man. Mother love and father love, brother love and sister love, though sometimes grown dim under adverse conditions, and sometimes apparently disappearing entirely from the life, nevertheless, with the majority of people, exercises a life-long sway over the heart. The family will never die.

We cannot appreciably affect the economic forces which are slowly but surely changing the complexion of family life in the western world; but at least there are some things which intelligent training can do for ourselves and our children and therefore for our homes. We come round to the same declaration in dealing with all our problems, and that is that education, the freest and the best that our scientific knowledge up to the present time can maintain, leads us out of many a wilderness. Husbands and wives need knowledge, need training in the finest of the fine arts, the art of love. Parents need to learn the delicate and difficult art of being parents; it does not just "come natural." All members of families need to be taught that the art of living together wholesomely and well does not come spontaneously; and they need to be trained from the ground up in the rudiments of this beautiful art.

Without religion in the family—not necessarily the old-time family prayers now become almost obsolete and impossible, but, what is more important, a real religion, liberal, individual, and free, permeating every act and

attitude and irradiating every face—the future of the family under the individualism of the day will look dark enough; but with religion, modest and tongue-tied though it be, that affects the voice and touch of every father and mother and then logically and inevitably every child, the home, no matter how complicated by our industrial atmosphere, may still be a sanctuary, a refuge, a place of joy and peace.

CHAPTER IX

A Telling Century

PERHAPS no one thing has more clearly revealed the vitality of Protestantism than that one century, the nineteenth, in which Christianity made its most powerful impact upon the world. Of course the first and second centuries, the apostolic age and a few generations following, made a similar impact, but upon a more restricted area. The spread of Christianity in the early centuries, due to the fall of Rome and the influx of the northern tribes, made such an impression upon Europe as to turn it into a Christian continent; but Asia, Africa, and other continents then undiscovered remained practically untouched by the message of Jesus until that great century during which was written the romantic and dramatic story of the world-wide diffusion of the Christian message.

This is not to say that the Greek and Roman churches sent out no messengers to various quarters of the earth, for they did; but it is to say that these efforts of the old ecclesiasticisms were more or less tentative, more or less sporadic, and only more or less successful. There is no discount, for example, on some of the missionary work done by the eastern or Greek Catholic church, far back in the fifteenth century. Two brothers, Cyril and Methodius, members of the church in Thessalonica founded by Paul, volunteered to go and help a Crimean king

decide whether to adopt Judaism, Mohammedanism, or Christianity as his state religion. Succeeding well, they set off to convert the savage Bulgarians. There again they succeeded, and passed on into wild regions today known as Hungary and converted the Moravians living there. Here was a triumph indeed; for these Moravians, sometimes known as United Brethren, have proved through the centuries to be the most tireless of all Christian bodies in pioneering with the gospel message. At one time, one out of twelve of their numbers served as missionaries while the other eleven supported him. They prepared the way for such a man as Dr. Wilfred Grenfell in Labrador and when their work was done, turned their missions over to others who continued so systematically that Labrador is Christian throughout at the present time. The Moravians, expelled from Austria in 1722, migrated to Herrn Hut, near Dresden, and were cordially welcomed by Count Von Zinzendorf who later became a bishop of their church and a promoter of their mission. Some three thousand missionaries have been sent out first and last by these tireless people. Beginning as Greek Catholics, they merged into the Protestant movement.

Great Roman Catholic missionaries have gone out devotedly into distant places. Ignatius Loyola, founder of the Society of Jesus, or Jesuits, was at first a young Spanish cavalier, who, wounded in battle with the French and knowing he could never fight again, decided to become a knight of the Virgin. At the University of Paris he found a group of congenial spirits who determined to do nothing in this world except to spread the

knowledge of "the true faith." Linked with the name of Loyola is the immortal one of Francis Xavier, the greatest of all Catholic missionaries. These men invaded the Orient, and Xavier spent many years in India. He never chose to learn the native language but depended always upon interpreters and felt at the end of his life profound dissatisfaction with the results of his labors. He wrote to Loyola, "The natives (of India) are so terribly wicked that they can never be expected to embrace Christianity." To secure the baptism of infants, with or without the knowledge and consent of parents, seems to have been, and still to be, the policy of the Roman church in foreign lands, just to get them into the fold. This policy cannot but be superficial in its results. It remained for Protestantism, with all the drive and force imparted to it by the age of industry and commerce, of reason and individualism, to go at the business of propagation with system, organization, and such a penetration as to produce permanency in results.

I. PROTESTANT MISSIONS IN INDIA

The closing years of the eighteenth century and the dawn of the nineteenth marked the beginning of a tidal wave, slow and gradual at first, increasing in force and power with the advancing decades, that has shaken to the very foundation old sleeping civilizations and social structures. First, eighteen chaplains attached to the British East India Company, began doing a little work among the people of India. They were followed by Christian Friedrich Schwartz who went out in 1750 and gave his life to South India until his death at seventy-

two at the close of the century. Six years before the death of Schwartz, in 1792 there landed in Bengal, William Carey, who has been termed the father and founder of modern missions. He was a cobbler by trade, working in his youth with a book beside him on his bench and growing into a Baptist preacher of local reputation and power. In an assembly of ministers he one time asked the question whether the command of Jesus to go out and preach the gospel were not obligatory upon the men of his day. An aged divine interrupted him, saying, "Sit down, young man. When God is ready to convert the heathen, he will do it without your help or mine." The young man, however, was not to be so easily squelched. He sat down then, but he kept bobbing up until, with the help of some of his friends at home who undertook to hold the ropes for him to go down into the mine, and with his great motto which has become classic, "Attempt great things for God and expect great things from God," he finally landed in India.

There he spent a long and honored and useful life, translating the Scriptures into the native tongue, establishing a college at Calcutta and presiding over it, until at his death, after thirty years of service, he left behind him a strong Christian community. Slowly and surely he had added converts, carefully trained and deeply grounded. Carey adopted a policy, not of gathering large numbers of communicants or scattering the message widely and thinly over the country, but of training native Christians to be their own preachers and evangelists, a method which is followed to this day by the wisest leaders of missionary effort. He assailed social

abuses, like the burning of widows upon the funeral pyres of their husbands, until he persuaded the British government to abolish them.

Other great men, like Alexander Duff, representing the established church of Scotland, came out to take up the torch when the hands of Carey failed. Duff continued his work in Calcutta until 1863; and while his converts were not numbered by thousands or even hundreds, they included many high caste Hindus of brilliant mental gifts and strength of character sufficient to influence their fellow countrymen all over India. Duff was a man of very great scholarly attainment, fine judgment, and strength of personality.

Early in the nineteenth century, America, that new Christian country, took a hand in this world-wide movement. Adoniram Judson left American shores for India, a Congregationalist commissioned by the newly formed missions board of his church, but on the way across he decided, after careful study of his Bible, that he must be immersed, and so he cut himself off from his supporters at home; but his action resulted in the formation of a Baptist missionary society which adopted him as its representative. Turned aside from the inhospitable shores of India, not permitted to land by the officials of the British East India Company—one of whom had said he would rather see a band of devils in India than a band of missionaries—Judson went on to Burma where he entered upon a life-long work. He endured untold hardships and persecutions, was imprisoned at one time for two years, wearing chains. His devoted wife brought provisions to the jail for him and some of

his fellow prisoners. For months he daily anticipated martyrdom, heard the axes ground in the morning and saw fellow prisoners led out to their death. At last, however, by the intervention of the English themselves he gained freedom and journeyed down the river Irawaddy to his home. He remarked later that unless you have floated down the river on a raft in the moonlight, after two years in prison, with your wife by your side and your children round you, you have never known the height of happiness in this world. By the time Judson died, he had round him a Christian community, well trained in the Christian faith, of some thirty-five hundred people.

During that world-changing century, thousands of missionaries have entered India, and with them have gone the arts and the sciences of the west, medical, sanitary, and agricultural, to increase the prosperity of the people, to save life and to prolong it, to feed and to clothe. Along with these products of the scientific era and the machine age have gone the literature and art of Christian Europe, until subtly and all but invisibly Christian ideals have permeated the life and thought of the people. The attempt of Mahatma Gandhi to turn back the tide of the machine age and to re-establish the old-fashioned hand industries of the past, many of his own best friends consider to be just as futile as the attempt of King Canute to turn back by his unaided word the advancing tide. However, Gandhi's interest in and his admiration for the teaching and the character of Jesus, shared by his friend Rabindranath Tagore, is influencing all India. These intelligentsia of the Orient,

while little attracted by the organizations and the machinery of the Christian church, are none the less intensely attracted by the personality of its founder. They are reading, studying, and lecturing about the New Testament all over India and putting their own interpretation upon it; and who knows but that these oriental minds, with their genius for religion, may in the long run give us a truer knowledge and a more successful embodiment of our Master than we westerners have ever attained? Thus the east may turn round and teach the west.

II. CHINA AND JAPAN

It was at the dawn of the nineteenth century, in 1807, that the first Protestant missionary landed in Canton, China—Robert Morrison, sent out by the London Missionary Society. Because of English hostility, he made his journey in an American ship; and because of Chinese hostility, he had to keep secret his purpose in entering the country. He hired out to a mercantile company, and at night in a deep cellar, by the light of an earthen lamp, he toiled away at his translation of the scriptures into Chinese. It took him seven years to put out his first translation and to win his first convert; and when he died in 1834, there were just ten Chinese Christians in the whole country. Today, less than a century from Morrison's death, there are schools, colleges, hospitals, and orphanages all over China, with thousands of Christians. The leading men of the new China are nearly all of them graduates of Christian schools and colleges, or European or American ones. The

new republic, when it becomes firmly welded and grows into a united nation, bids fair to be Christian in its outlook. The science and the industry of western civilization, China will increasingly adopt—like India she cannot help it; and open to criticism as so much of this western machine-made civilization may be, it nevertheless carries with it the spirit of the age of reason which rapidly is laying hold upon the world. China, like the rest, must ultimately be Christian; and perhaps China, too, may give us lessons in the genuine article.

The story of Japan, much more startling and dramatic, lies open for the least expert observer to comprehend. Japan, even more than the Thibet of today, lay withdrawn from the world, a hermit nation, during the first half of the nineteenth century. The Mikado by royal decree had forbidden any of his people to leave their shores and had declared that if any Christian, or even the Christians' God himself, should set foot in the island, he should pay for it with his head. It was not until 1853 that an American squadron, under the command of Commodore Perry, sailed into Yeddo Bay, the harbor of Tokyo, and dropped anchor. Perry, so the story goes, spread the American flag over the capstan of his vessel, laid on it the open Bible, read the hundredth Psalm, and opened the ports of Japan without the firing of a gun to the entrance of Christianity, diplomacy, and commerce.

In a half century, Japan underwent a revolution, a bloodless revolution, in ways, manners, and customs. She has proved another wonder of the world. She has adopted European thought and culture, European man-

ufacture and arts, European military and naval policies; she has become the England of the east. Japan set out to secure a place in the sun. Today she occupies a foremost position among the great powers at all international gatherings. There followed the inevitable reaction, and the Japanese wondered if they had not gone too far in adopting the western ways of life. They became more nationally self-conscious. They demanded the leadership of their own religious life and got it. Missionaries today in Japan have retired to the advisory position which ultimately they must hold in all foreign countries, and gave way to a local mastery in the local church. At this moment, one Japanese out of every two hundred and fifty owes allegiance to some form of Christianity; and many of the leaders in the life of Japan are avowed Christians.

The factory employees in this island kingdom increased in a single year in 1914 from three hundred thousand to nearly a million; and today there are two millions of them, with atrocious conditions of factory life. Along with the benefits that have come from western thought, the inevitable evils of the machine age have descended heavily upon the culture of Japan. From this on, we may be sure, Japan will take up and handle her own problems; and with such devoted spirits as Kagawa and a host of others, we may be sure that in the end she will reach Christian solutions. The story of Kagawa, as narrated in semi-autobiographical fashion in his great novel, *Before the Dawn*, and in the reports of those who have seen his settlement work in Osaka, stirs the dramatic sense of any who hear it. A student of Tokyo Univer-

sity, an artistic and sensitive spirit, he plunges into the depths of poverty in the slums of his native city, and amid disease and filth gives himself to the service of unfortunate fellow-men and women. This man's life alone shines like a Christian lighthouse in his native land.

III. The Dark Continent—Africa

The continent of Africa appeals to the interest and imagination of the world at the present time more perhaps than any other quarter of the globe. Cecil Rhodes' dream of the Cape to Cairo railroad, while not yet realized, will doubtless materialize in a very few years. Already automobile lines make the journey from one end of the continent to the other. Only with difficulty can we recall that within the lives of some of us, not yet old, that great continent for the most part was marked on our school maps "unexplored." Today there is scarcely a mile of it, even including the trackless Sahara, which has not been traversed, plotted, and explored.

Three great names stand out above all others in the romance of African exploration; and of the three, two were Christian missionaries. Robert Moffat, an English gardener born in Scotland, for more than half a century lived and worked in the heart of the dark continent, meeting dangers and enduring disease with such courage that the savages declared concerning him and his helpers, "These men must have ten lives, since they are so fearless of death." At eighty-three, Moffat spoke in London in 1878 and one who heard him described him as "a son of Anak in stature, erect, his features strongly marked,

his venerable locks and long white beard adding majesty to his appearance . . . his voice strong and musical." The story is well known of his arrival among the Boers in the early part of that wonderful nineteenth century, of how he expressed his determination to find Afrikaner, that ruthless, bloodthirsty king of so many united tribes, and try to make a Christian of him. Said one Boer farmer, "He will set you up for a mark for his boys to shoot at." Said another, "He will strip off your skin and make a drumhead of it." And another, "He will make a drinking cup of your skull." He found Afrikaner and made a friend and Christian out of him. Moffat married an English girl and together they went farther into the heart of the country and built that beautiful home at Kuruman which became a center of hospitality for all passing adventurers and remained so for forty years. Here David Livingstone, later found his wife in the Moffats' daughter, Mary.

Of course when one thinks of Africa one thinks of Dr. Livingstone. Some of us remember when he was lost for seven years in the blackness of that unexplored land and when Henry M. Stanley, a New Orleans newspaper man, set out to hunt for him and found him "about his Master's business" in the thick of African swamps and jungles. He found him where he was not lost. We can easily forget, however, that the great explorer and physician was first and foremost a missioner. This Scotch lad toiled through his early years with one hand upon the loom and the other holding a Latin grammar or a Latin classic. He took his medical degree intending to go to China, but while waiting for the

opium war to stop he heard that there was need of men to join Moffat in Africa. He promptly set out. While he was journeying to the Moffat home at Kuruman, a lion met him, attacked him, and shattered his left arm, so that after he had pieced it together the best he could himself, it hung limp and practically useless throughout all the rest of his life. For a time Livingstone practiced his profession among the natives; then, seeing that what was needed most of all in Africa was exploration, he refused thereafter all but cases of great seriousness or of emergency, and devoted his life to the long journeys back and forth, in and out, up and down, in opening up the so-called dark continent to the light of commerce, religion, and civilization. He thought nothing of seven years away from the base, or a seven-thousand-mile trip from Zanzibar to Banana. He discovered the Zambezi River; his were the first eyes in a white face to behold the wonderful Victoria Falls; backed by the Royal Geographical Society and in their employ, he struck out alone, with his native carriers, and threaded the heart of Africa with lines of light.

Thanks to Livingstone, we can map it all now. He never carried nor used firearms. He never fought or resisted the natives. He was known and loved by them all over the continent. They held his life a sacred thing to be guarded with their own. He it was who fought the slave trade with a bitter and undying hatred; he it was who fought the Belgian atrocities in the rubber forests; he it was who gave his life and his strength, crippled though he was, for the lives of these savage peoples, and they recognized him as a heaven-sent friend. When at

last he died, on his knees, in the night and alone in his little tent on the shores of Lake Bangweola, his boys took out his heart and buried it there, where a monument stands over it at the present time; and preserving his body as best they could in wrappings of mud and grasses, they carried it three thousand miles, swimming rivers while they held it above their heads, threading swamps and jungles, to the western coast where it could be put on shipboard and carried back to sleep in Westminster Abbey. In that sanctuary of the illustrious dead he lies; and many a tourist, wandering in the dim religious light, comes suddenly upon a great dark stone in the pavement just above the breast of the explorer sleeping there and reads with a quickened heartbeat the words that he himself wrote, "May God bless the man, be he Englishman, American, or Turk, who helps to heal this open sore of the world."

Livingstone, often homesick to the heart, longed many a time for his old father, whom he loved better than any other human being except Mary his wife, and when asked one time what he would desire above everything else, replied, "To sit by the ingleside in that little Scotch cottage and talk all evening with my father." Of Mary, he said, "She was always the best spoke in the wheel"; and once, when starting on an important journey, he remarked, "Glad indeed am I that I am to be accompanied by my guardian angel." When she died in 1862, he who had faced so many deaths and dangers completely broke down and cried like a child. In his journal he wrote, "Oh, my Mary, my Mary! How often we have longed for a quiet home since you and I were

cast adrift at Kolobeng." And again, "My dear, dear Mary has been this evening a fortnight in heaven. For the first time in my life I feel willing to die." Yet, when some wondering person once said to him, "Dr. Livingstone, how can you make such sacrifices?" he replied, "I never made a sacrifice."

The third shining name in the constellation of Africa, Henry M. Stanley, though not the name of an avowed missionary, nevertheless marks a Christian explorer, probably made more thoroughly Christian by association with the dauntless but gentle Livingstone, who carried on the work that fell from the doctor's dead hands. Not by any means all of the work in advancing the cause of Christianity and of civilization has been accomplished by avowedly religious workers, but much of it by secular assistance, by commercial men and diplomats.

IV. Christianity Sails the South Seas

Turn now to the South Seas, the scattered and populous islands under the Southern Cross, those dreamlands in the blue waters, those paradises of the Pacific—Hawaii, Tahiti, Fiji, Samoa, Australia, all of Polynesia. It is a mistake to suppose that these romantic regions originally supported a life and an atmosphere that was like Eden for innocence, peace, and sweetness. On the contrary, they were homes of atrocities, cannibalism, and infanticide. Sick people and the old were murdered to get them out of the way. In practically all of these "paradises" the food supply, not so satisfying as one would suppose as it dropped into the laps of the natives, was

eked out by the more strengthening and the more palatable human flesh, boiled, stewed, or fried. The names of John Williams, George Gordon, Bishop Patteson, and many other martyrs still burn in the sky above these islands of the South Seas; to say nothing of such other names as John Geddie, whose monument in the New Hebrides reads, "When he came he found no Christians; when he left, he left no heathen." James Chalmers of New Guinea, the Binghams and the Castles of Hawaii, Titus Coan of Hilo, and a host of others have written their names into the annals of transformation of those islands of the seas.

We have lately seen many false pictures of mission work and mission effects in Polynesia, in such popular plays as *The Bird of Paradise, Rain* and the like. We are constantly reading in the magazines how the "innocent children of nature" ought to have been left alone with their simple and beautiful customs—no doubt referring to the annual sacrifice of a young maiden to Pele by pitching her into the crater of Kilauea, or to the inalienable privilege of roasting human tenderloins over tropical fires. These indignant journalists get up quite a sweat over the "vinegar-faced, lugubrious, and woe-begone religious cranks," who insist upon putting clothes upon naïve natives. Rather more influential than these popular half-baked utterances ought to be the words of a scientist, unbiased if anybody is, by the name of Charles Darwin. This is what he wrote: "They forget, or will not remember, that human sacrifices and the power of an idolatrous priesthood, a system of profligacy unparalleled in any other part of the world, infanticide,

a consequence of that system, bloody wars, where the conquerors spared neither women nor children—that all these have been abolished, and that dishonesty, intemperance, and licentiousness have been greatly reduced by the introduction of Christianity. In a voyager, to forget these things would be base ingratitude; for should he chance to be on the point of shipwreck on some unknown coast, he will most devoutly pray that the lesson of the missionary may have extended thus far."

Captain Cook, the foremost explorer in these waters, a remarkably accurate observer, ratifies these words of Darwin. He declared that from one-fourth to two-thirds of the children of Tahiti, for example, were strangled or buried alive. Only two children were usually allowed to any family. Few of the natives died of natural causes, as the sick and the aged were brutally murdered. Polygamy was universal and widows were strangled on the death of any man of prominence. Gods and demons alike were worshiped, with human sacrifices and wild carrousels like the orgies of hell. All sorts of taboos held the people in bondage. Some existing depravities in these islands, including the abuse of liquors introduced by white men, the debaucheries of the half-whites, and the devastating diseases which have come in with civilization, may not present a pretty picture; but at least it is no worse than the original photographs of these "paradises of the Pacific"; and one who has been in Honolulu, who has seen the schools and colleges and the huge Christian churches of natives as well as whites, who has listened to the choirs and to the Royal Hawaiian Band, as so many trans-Pacific tourists these days have done and can do,

can well say with Hamlet, "Look on this picture and on that!"

V. THE CRITICS OF THE WORLD CRUSADE

So much for a hasty sketch of a marvelous movement covering a marvelous century. Perhaps we are as yet too near to it to appraise it at its proper value and significance. We are seldom able to estimate the importance of our own period of time; this was true, no doubt, of the Elizabethans, of the artists of the Renaissance, of the men and women in any particularly world-moulding period. It is certainly true concerning us who are so near to the nineteenth century which has so reshaped the world. Some uninformed tourist or business man travels in China for a longer or shorter period, seeing only superficially, and sneers at missionaries. He does not realize that these quiet men and women have carried within the Chinese wall an influence stronger than any poison gas or high explosive, an influence which is giving to China a sense of nationality and making it over new. Some tourist or hunter goes to India, stays six weeks, six months, six years, and thinks he knows something about the deep under-currents of silent Indian life. A group of such Englishmen, returning on a ship from India, were discussing the futility of missions and missionaries. One of them, a tiger hunter, loudly declared, "I've been six months in India and I haven't even seen a missionary." He did not observe a quiet, unpretentious gentleman who was listening to the conversation, Bishop Thoburn on his way home on furlough. The quiet little man spoke up, saying, "Did you see any tigers?" The hunter

glared at him and replied, "Certainly. I saw many tigers." Then remarked Bishop Thoburn quietly, "I am a missionary. I have been thirty years in India and I never saw a tiger." Men easily see what they go hunting for.

Most of the objections popularly raised against the work of foreign missions, on inspection, prove just as superficial as such remarks. "We have plenty of heathen here at home. Let us take care of them first, before we begin sending money and men to those far away." The trouble is that we never do take care of those at home; and we are less likely to, the less we refuse to take a part in the world-wide task. Charity may begin at home, indeed, but it doesn't stay there. Those who offer this objection generally prove tight-fisted enough and conservative enough when it comes to any progressive religious enterprise within the home land.

"So much money is wasted in administration!" Surely, it costs something to administer any such world enterprise. Think how much more it would cost if any government or set of governments should send expeditionary forces of the same size to the same distant quarters. In any such peaceful penetration as this, there must be not only the expeditionary force but the base, and the line of supplies. Such a huge task calls for organization and administration, and such things cost money. On the whole, however, the expense of gathering the necessary funds and maintaining the necessary line of communications in this world enterprise has not exceeded nor even equaled any other expedition or crusade with which it may be compared, if there is anything with which it

may be compared. Perhaps the greatest cause for distaste in the popular mind for this word "missions" lies in the type of administration which has been absolutely necessary, the gathering of pennies in boxes, the women's and the children's efforts which have had such a part in it, the meetings and the exhortations, the beating of the thickets and the combings with a fine-tooth comb for numerous and minute contributions. Objectors fail to see that the very minuteness of this work and its far-flung character deepens the education of the home constituency and develops a home army to back up the advance guard.

Another objection commonly offered is the duplication of effort due to the numerous denominations. This condition, of course, follows hard upon the individualism of the Protestant mind during the nineteenth century. Individualism running amuck once more. All we can do is to make the best of human nature as it exists and of the conditions in which it is placed. This very division of effort, however, has compensations of its own; once again, education feeds and grows upon it, scatters more widely because of it. Furthermore, evidences begin to appear that, having done its work, this excessive individualism begins to yield before the increasing spirit of co-operation and merger of the present day. Certain it is that on distant fields there is little overlapping; the missionaries themselves care little or nothing for denominational differences; confronting the huge task on the firing line, they are welded together much more closely than the forces back home. The road to Christian unity, if one ever appears, will be a road built

upon co-operation in practical effort and not upon definitions, propositions, statements of faith. This world task will unite, is uniting, the individualistic denominations as nothing else can do. Protestantism has suffered and must suffer from the defects of its qualities, the disadvantages of its freedom and its individualism.

If one will but shake himself free from narrow and provincial views, look beyond the little horizon of his own city, state, and nation, and try to comprehend the movements in the whole wide world, he can scarcely remain oblivious to the Christian influence which may be likened to a mighty subterranean river or, better yet, a whole water system flowing under and through all lands. It pierces India to the very heart of its thought and life; it has shaken China loose from its old foundation until the four hundred millions of that once inchoate empire are rapidly welding into a national whole; it has made Japan over new; it has turned Africa from a dark continent into a rapidly lightening land; it has made of Australia and Polynesia real paradises to take the place of false ones. And who can measure what its final influence may become in changing governments from the hard and selfish policies of imperialism to co-operation in the form of courts and councils, leagues and associations, undergirded by a truly Christian spirit. Imperialism giving way to humanism! What a consummation, and perhaps just over the horizon! If the nineteenth century has seen a world rapidly pervaded by this powerful and transforming spirit, the spirit of the Nazarene, is it too much to hope that the twentieth century may witness a peaceful world revolution in the relations of peoples, castes, classes, and industrial systems?

CHAPTER X

Scientific Benevolence

THE changed attitude of the Protestant world towards charity, if not a revolution, marks at least a definite and progressive reformation as contrasted with the views and practices of medieval Christianity. The church had always held that the giving of alms was one of its primary obligations. The fathers had enjoined it upon the religious orders line upon line and precept upon precept. To care for the needy and unfortunate, evidently without discrimination, the monasteries and the nunneries had regarded as a supreme duty.

Not so much the laity, but rather the clergy, were charged with the dispensation of alms and aid. Naturally the laity side-stepped all responsibility and turned the matter of relief over to the monks and the nuns where they had been taught it belonged. They gave their money freely into the treasuries of the church, thereby purchasing merit and safety in another world; then they washed their hands of the matter, turning it over to the priesthood. Naturally, in the religious corruption of the times, trusts were abused, sometimes funds were misappropriated, and scandals ensued. The system lent itself to such possibilities, and it is not surprising that such results appeared. This is not to say that no charity was handed out by the feudal lords from their castles and in their villages. Many a mendicant got his dinner in the

great hall and slept in the stables, like Caedmon and even Ivanhoe; but for the most part it was the abbeys which took in the wanderers and the derelicts.

I. SCIENTIFIC STUDY OF CHARITY

Gradually after the dawn of the Reformation charity took on new forms proceeding from a new philosophy. The old mother church herself has changed with the changing spirit and the changing science. Today her charities are usually administered with all the enlightenment and skill which prompts most of the so-called Protestant welfare work. She possesses, too, an advantage in her centralized authority; she can say to this man go and he goes, and to this one come and he comes. For the conduct of great institutions, a central ecclesiasticism possesses a particularly strong arm. The individualized, and therefore more or less scattered, resources of independent charities must suffer from much friction and lost motion. Furthermore, the handing on of skill and training from one generation of workers to another lends an inherited strength to the ecclesiasticism over the less closely knit organizations of independent character. It must be admitted, however, that the new spirit and scientific skill even of Catholic charities derives directly from our scientific era which to greater or less degree derives in turn from the free spirit of the Protestant reformation.

When this scientific era had got fairly under way in the nineteenth century, those charged with the relief of the unfortunate began digging down to find the root causes of poverty with a view to their eradication. States,

cities, authorities upon whom rested responsibility for the care of the dependent sought for origins and the cure of them. The poor laws of England, with the generations of dispute pro and con regarding them, educated the English public concerning the matter of pauperism to a considerable degree of enlightenment. Under the constant hammering of the Earl of Shaftesbury and his associates the English public was reluctantly convinced that their relief measures created the very thing which they sought to alleviate; and ultimately the English nation brought about the repeal of the whole system. Hard upon this repeal came charity organizations both in that country and in this, followed by monumental investigations on both sides of the water concerning the causes of poverty, as for example the huge scientific investigation of Charles Booth in east London entitled "The Life and Labor of the People of London." The charity organization society, or the provident association, or the associated charities of practically all our great American cities grew up in the nineteenth century and became the instrumentality for the relief of distress, occupying the place once held by the monasteries and the nunneries. The public delegated its work to organized charity with a personnel supposed, at least, to be scientific and expert. These organizations, not content with the traditional view that "the poor ye have always with you," undertook to canvass the causes of poverty and even dreamed of its abolition.

At first, charity organization contented itself mostly with immediate relief. But it soon realized that to poultice the sore spot was not enough; the root cause must be

found and, if possible, cured. Dr. Richard C. Cabot, of Harvard University, defines the goal of modern Christian charity as follows: "Suffering, misery-that-enslaves, is the first, though not the only, enemy against whom we campaign; not all suffering, but only that which enslaves. The mile-runner at the three-quarter point is suffering acutely in body and often in mind also. But he wants no aid and would never think of himself as entangled. . . . Freedom, therefore, and the free chance to live his life with whatever suffering that life necessarily entails, but no more, is what we want to attain through social work. . . . But because it is his freedom that we want and because relief of suffering may enslave him afresh by sapping his energies in dependence, it is always in our minds that relief by money like relief by morphine may give ease, but not freedom, and so may increase the trouble that we wish to cure."

We are all familiar with the painstaking tabulations of cases made by charity organization investigators as to the causes of poverty. We have seen percentages as to how much was due to sickness and death, to accident, to drunkenness, to thriftlessness and laziness, to licentiousness and the abuse of the sex life, to inheritance from diseased or defective ancestry, and to the imprisonment of the breadwinner. We have realized how difficult it was to draw the line between one and another of these causes, that heredity might be the occasion of sickness and death, that drunkenness might either be the cause or the result of sickness or of thriftlessness or of licentiousness. It has gradually dawned upon our comprehension that all these causes, twisted and intertwined, like the

roots of alfalfa reaching down into the dark obscurity of the muck and the soil underneath, matted and dense, could not be traced with mathematical accuracy. These so-called causes became in our comprehension symptoms rather than the diseases. One of the surprising things that came to notice out of the period we are now scanning is the fact that only about a third of the applicants to charity organizations for aid were found worthy to receive it: that is, what most of these unfortunates needed was friendship, advice, wise guidance, and self help. Out of this fact grew a still stronger conviction on the part of welfare workers that the causes of poverty did not lie so clearly on the surface as had at first appeared.

II. CAUSES OF POVERTY

Then came a great new step forward, investigation as to conditions producing poverty rather than so-called causes, conditions inherent in our social structure, conditions for which the individuals themselves were not responsible and which they were helpless to change, conditions for which no one individual could be blamed but for which the whole social order is open to criticism. One of these conditions that smote the social worker in the face appeared in the damage done to the human being by the new-made machine which dominated our industrial era. Accidents to workmen, putting them out of business, taking the bread out of the mouths of their children, appeared to be a condition back of the so-called cause of poverty, sickness. Many workers, disabled for long periods by the inexorable machine, could not provide for their own; some, crippled and maimed, became

public charges, took to drink, possibly to crime. The railways, most prolific of the sources of injury done to men, the steel mills, glass factories, the mines, all the vast machinery of production, came under the intense scrutiny of the scientific welfare worker, and the noise made by these investigations caused the "safety first" movement in answer to public demand. Railways improved the conditions of working for their men, introduced safety appliances, and greatly reduced the amount of damage done by the machine to man. Manufacturing took a leaf out of the book of transportation and likewise rendered conditions of working and handling machines safer for the men who had to operate them. Much ground has been conquered, though much remains yet to be desired, in this realm of safety while at work.

Certain industries by their very nature expose the workmen in them to grave danger. Painters who have to work indoors with white lead generally break down in early middle life and often die. Sanding, scraping, painting hour after hour in confined spaces, inhaling the white lead, leads almost inevitably to serious poisoning; and the effects of it, when they fall, fall instantaneously, and fall hard. Flouring mills and bakeries, all occupations carried on in dust-laden atmospheres are likely to produce pulmonary and bronchial diseases which cut short the lives of the workers. Then the cause of poverty becomes not sickness and death but the condition under which the machine age places the workman. The automobile industry takes its toll of crippled and disabled men, as do all these other great factories. The reform of working conditions becomes then a dominating mo-

tive with the scientifically minded who take interest in social welfare. The reduction of risk to its lowest terms in the processes of manufacture becomes the responsibility of the whole of society.

Fatigue appears as one of the most fruitful conditions of the so-called causes of poverty. When a workman continues at a more or less monotonous task for many hours at a stretch, the hands lose their dexterity, the brain its clearness, and a slip in handling the machinery may at any moment come with disastrous and even fatal results. This, to say nothing of the temptation to stimulants and narcotics which comes with over-fatigue. Whereas we formerly listed drunkenness as the productive cause of poverty in such a case, we now see clearly enough to assign the deeper cause or condition as fatigue. The campaign for the shortening of hours made by organized labor as well as by the Federal Council of Churches, which is organized Protestantism, has had a marked effect already in reducing the condition of over-fatigue. Here again, much ground yet remains to be conquered by those actuated by real charity for their fellow-men.

Owen B. Young, of the General Electric Company, is quoted as saying in a recent speech: "Slowly we are learning that low wages for labor do not necessarily mean high profits for capital. We are learning that an increasing wage level is wholly consistent with a diminishing price level. We are learning that productivity of labor is not measured alone by the hours of work, nor even by the test of physical fatigue in a particular job.

When zest departs, labor becomes drudgery. When exhaustion enters, labor becomes slavery."

The scientific welfare workers early discovered how disastrous to the well-being of large masses of people was child labor, and early set to work in England and in America to reduce the amount of it. Child labor legislation, passed by the federal government, after strenuous effort on the part of sociologists, reduced by thousands the numbers of children employed in such factories as designed their products for interstate commerce. The federal statute could not reach factories whose products were consumed within the borders of the states. Many children under sixteen are still employed, particularly in certain southern industries in the United States, and upon farms. It is all well enough for a farmer to utilize the services of his child under sixteen, even to the extent of keeping him out of school at times for the purpose; but where a child is put to work in the tobacco fields, or the cotton fields, or the sugar-beet fields, or in carrying on a large industry, and is kept out of school for the purpose, the effect upon both the child and his family is almost always decidedly unwholesome. The tendency of true charity, scientific in character, is to broaden child labor legislation and to make more drastic compulsory education; for the child which possesses a fair public school training does not often grow up into a nitwit who makes all kinds of foolish economic blunders until he and his family become a charge upon the public charity.

Unsanitary and unhygienic housing and homes stand out like a carbuncle upon the body of the social organ-

ism. Such crowding as makes it necessary for more than two to sleep in a room, the density of many tenement rookeries in all our great cities, the makeshift of tents or houseboats along water courses and wharves, with their malaria-breeding mosquitoes, the collections of garbage and offal, and old fashioned outhouses in backyards behind crowded tenements—these pictures are not overdrawn, but exist at the moment of writing in the very city where this is written, to say nothing of the bigger cities all over the country and even the world. The words of Lord Tennyson are almost as true now as they were half a century ago when they were written:

"There the smouldering fire of fever creeps along the rotted floor,
And the crowded couch of incest in the warrens of the poor."

In such conditions you cannot say that the cause of poverty is sickness and death, nor yet drunkenness nor licentiousness. Any of these things may happen, are bound to happen, in such conditions. It is the condition, then, that is the deeper underlying cause. All the causes which we listed thirty or forty years ago for poverty, dependence, pauperism, are now pushed further back to the conditions of existing society. Amos G. Warner's classic work on American charities sums up the story of the advancing ideas of the Protestant, scientific era in an illuminating résumé:

"In tracing the endless circle of poverty, degeneration and dependency, the characteristic isolated conditions—sickness, unemployment, defects of character, and absence of wage-earner—have disappeared as separate

causes and in their place the social structure itself appears, conditioning every life and determining the success or failure of the weaker groups. The charity worker, sorting cases in the endeavor to account for pauperism, was too much concerned with individuals and percentages to see the whole structure; the social missionary focused attention on habits and defects of character and settled the matter with the comprehensive and pessimistic proverb: 'Poor folks have poor ways'; while the scientist, disclaiming all responsibility for unsuccessful human nature, laid it on heredity. The social reformer in his turn seized upon some conspicuous social or industrial evil and threw the onus upon society as the exploiter of the poor, making the wage earner himself the victim of the situation. Each of these observers saw a portion of the whole social edifice in which pauperism and poverty, character and endowment, industry and environment, are co-ordinated sections. Seeing society as a whole, at last we arrive at the ancient truth, known but never yet fully visualized, that civilization is judged by what it does with and for the weakest members. . . . With the rise of the Protestant faiths and the development of humanitarian feeling, the poor became the concern of a larger group of persons until in our day it is the province of trained laymen in societies whose membership is not distinctively religious."

III. ABOLITION OF POVERTY IS THE MODERN AIM

The attack upon poverty and disability, then, becomes quite a different thing in the light of this increased penetration from what it was under the old assumption

that pauperism was inevitable and that the poor ye have always with you. Two attitudes are possible and have been assumed. One is the policy of hands off, let natural forces have play, let the weak and the unworthy go down, and let the fit survive. The other is the attitude of saving and preserving human life at all costs in the belief that while there is life there is hope of growth and development and possible usefulness. Under the former policy, charity becomes impossible; it is another case of *laissez faire;* the shiftless, the sick, the defective, the unfortunate are left to their fate for the good of the social whole. Crippled and deformed children are allowed to die; for example, a child born with hydro-cephalis or with syphilis is put out of the way mercifully. Under this philosophy, there would be no hospitals for crippled children, but those able to survive would be allowed to survive and the others to perish. If one urges that it is not nature by which we are surrounded but a social structure for which we are ourselves responsible, the answer comes from this school of social thinkers, "Then let the abuses of the structure we have built become apparent; do not palliate its abuses with a false philanthropy. The sooner society rises and rebels against untoward conditions, the better; and it will rebel all the quicker and reform itself all the more thoroughly because many who are not strong enough to battle its waves sink and drown. Charity is only an opiate to lull human discontent against human injustices."

The other position holds that human life is forever precious and promising. Nobody knows when a crippled or deformed child may turn out to be a Steinmetz or

some other kind of genius. Sometimes intellectual ability is in inverse ratio to physical ability. Allow all cripples or diseased among children to die without help and you may be shutting out a large amount of intellectual and spiritual light and leadership from the world. Furthermore, the very attitude of coldness and indifference is out of keeping with the best instincts of humanity. Even where it seems necessary to take human life, we have passed from the torture chamber and the stake to the scaffold and then the electric chair. We have sought to make the process as painless and humane as possible. The natural tendency of human nature at its best is to exercise mercy, to prolong life; and the mere neglect to exert every effort blunts the sensibilities of those responsible for the care of the suffering. A sharp division exists among physicians as to whether it is ever justifiable to let Nature take her course and to permit a human life to sink beneath her waves; and when it comes to the actual pinch, it is the rarest thing in the world to find a physician willing to take a chance against the preservation of a human life. They may theorize as they will, but faced with an actual situation they rarely fail to exercise the fullest charity.

Concerning such matters as eugenics, however, there is little room for difference of opinion. The manifest obligation of the state would dictate the utmost care to prevent the propagation of unwholesome children. The segregation of those afflicted with heritable diseases, with feeble-mindedness, with incorrigible criminal instincts, and possibly the sterilization of those so afflicted, has already to a degree been adopted by governments and will

undoubtedly increase. Many people should never be allowed to marry or to mate; and nobody but the state can deal with such classes.

The attack upon the conditions which produce poverty has increasingly become organized, systematized, scientific. If a certain standard of living has been ascertained to be essential for health and wholesomeness—and it has—then organized efforts must be put forth to promote and preserve such a standard. About twenty-one hundred dollars a year is essential for the support of a family of five, the federal bureau of labor has estimated. To secure this standard for all the people in all America will require an attack all along the line. Labor has found it necessary to organize for collective bargaining. A type of socialism harmonious with the teachings of Jesus, which calls itself Christian socialism, has been adopted by many social and religious leaders. Social settlements, whose primary object is not relief but rather first-hand study of social conditions and the exercise of friendliness between students and workers, have multiplied in congested centers of population. All this manifests the scientific and Protestant spirit at work in an attempt to remedy the defects of a scientific machine-made age. It is science correcting itself.

Within the last generation in America the right of labor to organize has won recognition. That labor is not a commodity to be bought and sold in the cheapest market, has at last become a truism. Labor is flesh and blood, home and children, spiritual welfare. No man has the absolute right to hire and fire at will. The bigger his factory and the larger the body of his employees, the

less absolute right has he to conduct his business as he pleases. His business affects too many lives, both of workers and consumers. Society makes his business; he is responsible to society. These statements, which seem to us axiomatic today, would have startled and shocked most business people thirty years ago; which only goes to show how far we have come under the guidance of the scientific spirit in the attack upon social injustice, so productive of poverty and pauperism.

Social settlements, in which students of society and economics voluntarily take up their homes in massed districts of workers, like Toynbee Hall in London and Hull House in Chicago, have multiplied and have served as invaluable scouts out beyond the firing line of social reform. Graham Taylor, in Chicago, giving up a home of comfort and even of luxury, to go and live among the submerged; Miss Jane Addams, leading a long and honorable life devoted entirely to this pioneer work; and scores of others in America carrying forward the tradition and spirit of Arnold Toynbee in England—who can say how much these trail blazers in the wilderness of social service have done in elevating the standards of living among hand-workers?

Some governments in the western world have taken tentative steps toward the provision of old-age pensions for those who need them and some leaders in industry have followed. Widows' pensions have in like fashion received some attention. Minimum wage scales for women workers have passed some state legislatures, as have also workmen's compensation acts. Such measures, destined to increase with our increasing enlightenment,

some would not call charity at all but merely justice. Very well, let them be called what you will, they are friendliness merged with science, humanitarianism allied with economics; and that is the spirit of free inquiry and the scientific handling of social conditions in the Protestant age.

Meantime, for the immediate need hospitals and institutions for the care of the defective and the unfit increase in numbers. The old-time prejudice against the hospital and even the fear of it is rapidly fading away. Even the rank and file of the people have come to know that the hospital is the best place for sick people, and that the hospital is the best place in which to die. Women seek hospitals increasingly in childbirth, realizing that the chances of fatality are far less than in the private home. While fees are paid for service in hospitals by those able to pay them, many patients receive the benefits free of charge. The hospital, then, is part charity and part economics, partly a poultice upon the sore of humanity and partly the scientific surgery which goes to the root of the ulcer. Who could draw the line in the great and growing system of hospitals between the element of charity and the element of social science? The two go hand in hand as they should and do in the constantly extending attack upon the roots of misfortune in human life.

The attempt of social science is to give to every individual certain opportunities, variously listed by various students. Dr. Richard C. Cabot gives two or three of these lists, as for example: "Self support (with one's family), self expression, self respect, respect of others, justice." Another list reads: "Adventure, security, recog-

nition, response. Of course Dr. Cabot recognizes the limitations of these expressions. "Self support"—who is really self supporting? We all depend on our fellows, on society, on Nature, on the round of the seasons, on the very insects, germs, and bacteria. "Self respect"—how many of us can honestly respect ourselves, with all our faults and failings, our limitations and egregious blunders? How much room is there for real self-respect? If, however, we accept the very fine definition of morality which Dr. Cabot puts forward, as the organization of all a person's desires around his master desire, we escape, as he assures us, the reproach of censoriousness and the deadness of conventions. "A person does wrong when he violates, not my standards or the world's customs, but his own ideals. He is fooling himself." Then Dr. Cabot adds in italics, "The social worker's goal, therefore, is the relief of misery and unhappiness so that people's enfranchised and organized desires can find their expression in the social relationships which are part of their natural outlet." Walter Lippman's figure of speech in *A Preface to Morals* is illuminating: "Morality thus becomes a traffic code designed to keep as many desires as possible moving together without too many violent collisions."

As another expert has summed up the work of social science, it is neighborliness, nothing but neighborliness. In rural or primitive sections, people have neighbors; but in congested districts society has to provide them, pay them, maintain them. We cannot live without neighbors, and the great cities destroy neighbors. Good Samaritans are hard to find in massed population; and, first or last, every one of us needs a good Samaritan.

Here, then, is the mission of Christian charity in human life. The word "charity" has been taken out of the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians and "love" substituted; and one wonders if there is not loss here. There is no greater word than love, to be sure; but charity is love with a certain connotation. It is too good a word to lose. Neighborliness, fellowship, the family spirit, the beloved community, the kingdom of God—this is the central thought of Jesus regarding human relationships; and this is the far-off divine event to which the social creation moves. Once again, this consummation involves the process of education, beginning with the youngest and the remotest and not neglecting those of advancing experience and those in the very thickest of the social whirl, long-drawn-out education, widespread education, the education of mind and also of heart. One is not a neighbor by instinct; one is not a devoted member of a family by intuition. It takes long training to live in a house by the side of a road and be a neighbor to man.

CHAPTER XI

Reason and Education

As far back as our information extends in antiquity, both in classic lands and in some others, we hear of attempts, more or less systematic and organized, to teach and train the youth. Most often, of course, religion occupied the chief place in such instruction. Israel had its schools of the prophets, and its synagogue schools in every village for children who did not expect to become professional religionists. The chief rabbis at Jerusalem, members of the Sanhedrin, like Hillel and Gamaliel, gathered their disciples about them to train their successors for rulership in the theocratic state.

Greece had her schools of rhetoric and even her pretentious universities, aside from the informal groups who met about the persons of her great philosophers. Athens, Tarsus in Asia Minor, and Alexandria in Egypt, call up to our minds pictures of noble institutions of learning that flourished in many other cities as well. The idea of a university dates well back into ancient times. No doubt such institutions varied greatly in plan and in efficiency. No doubt some of them, like the schools of the mandarins in the Chinese empire, spent their time in the mere drudgery of memorizing the classics of their civilization and of their religion. If one would gain an idea of the methods and the atmosphere of such a university, he needs only to go to Cairo and stroll through

the courtyards and the colonnades where Mohammedan students from all over the world assemble in Al-Hazar, perhaps the largest university in numbers in the world. Here Arab and Indian, sitting upon the pavement or lying prone, con over the Koran, chanting it over and over in sing-song voices, with here and there a teacher the center of a little group, as far as possible from the ideas of a university that prevail in our western and Protestant world.

The church through many centuries paid little heed to learning among the people and even frowned upon it. All through the early and middle ages, roughly speaking, there were colleges only for the clerics. The rank and file could neither read nor write. The monasteries held the only libraries and the only instruction in a darkened world. Joan of Arc and all her generals could not sign their names. St. Patrick, a Scotch lad, captured in Ireland, broke loose, found refuge in monasteries and convents as far away as the south of France and Italy, where he picked up learning and made his way back to Ireland to teach. Books were for the clergy; knowledge was for the priests; the people were supposed to be better off without it. The subtle policy of the church in those distant centuries seemed to be to keep the people in ignorance in order that they might be so much more easily handled, managed, dominated.

I. THE REVIVAL OF LEARNING

Then came the Renaissance, the revival of learning, accompanied by the Reformation. Greek literature, art, and philosophy came surging into the west like streams

of gold from the Orient. Men went into the east to bring it back with the eagerness with which they would have gone after gold. Doubtless the crusades, to a degree at least, prepared the way for this resurgence of curiosity and the desire to learn and know. Be that as it may, the masses of the people began to demand that plough boys and housemaids be able to read the scriptures; and rapidly the old monkish fastnesses of learning opened their doors to the invading hordes of the curious populace. Oxford, Cambridge, the Sorbonne, Louvain, and scores of others, threw off monasticism and took on a secular air. In the last four centuries under Protestantism changes have come, in rapid and revolutionary fashion, to transform the ideals and the practice of the educational process.

The separation of church and state, which became inevitable wherever the Protestant spirit carried through to its logical conclusion, resulted in the secularization of the whole educational purpose and machinery. Where church and state are kept apart, education naturally belongs to the state, not to the church; for the logic of such situation is inescapable, that not religion alone is the field for human culture and training, but all departments or all phases of human thought and learning. Of course, the church, in all lands and of all denominations, has sought to hold fast the prerogative of training youth under its own auspices and grounding them deeply in its own dogmas. Parochial schools and denominational colleges still exist, and no doubt will continue to exist, so long as religion is sectarian; but the tendency even of such institutions in a democratic environment is to

merge into a freer and larger atmosphere. The separation between church and state in any democracy may be delayed, but only delayed; sooner or later all institutions under state supervision must, in the nature of the case, become secularized. This process is going forward, even in countries of the Protestant world which still maintain a state church. The public schools of England, so-called because they are not public, do not represent the mass education of the English people. Even at the two great English universities, secularization goes forward slowly —for nearly everything moves slowly in conservative England—but surely. The German system of education has long been popular and secular. The United States, with its rigid separation of church and state from the very beginning, sends all its children, with almost negligible exception, to public schools that are really public.

II. MORE SECULARIZATION OF EDUCATION

Many of the older colleges in America, dating back to Colonial times, though founded by denominations and fostered under denominational care, have outgrown sectarian bounds and today are just as secular and free as the avowedly state institutions. Who can think of Harvard, Yale, Amherst, Williams, or even Princeton, as denominational institutions? Indeed, in the last generation, we have seen such universities as Vanderbilt, Northwestern, and Chicago, founded by denominational money and begun more or less under denominational supervision, expand almost overnight into thoroughly non-sectarian organizations. Such destiny awaits any college or university which is to keep pace with the

times. Many denominational colleges, some struggling for a meager existence and some fairly flourishing, still dot the country; but these tend either to burn out like candles or to transcend their denominational beginnings and control. The future and the spirit of the times promise very little for purely denominational attempts at education. Denominations themselves seem to be looking about beneath the huge legs of progress to find themselves dishonorable graves; amalgamation and co-operation seem to be the order of the day, not only in commerce and industry, but also in religion; it may well be that many of these struggling denominational institutions will find their future solved for them through the merger of their respective governing bodies, which will, of course, mean increasing freedom and increasing secularization. Education that is real education can never be labeled with sectarian names nor limited with sectarian bias.

III. MORE FREEDOM IN SCHOOLS

The educational world owes a heavy debt to the spirit of freedom which came in with the revival of learning and the Protestant Reformation; but what it owes already is not to be compared with what it will owe provided the spirit already manifested, more or less timidly and more or less in spots, shall go to its full and logical conclusion. The ground conquered is as nothing compared with the ground that yet remains to be conquered. The old traditionalism hangs on and refuses to die; the ancient ideals of the synagogue school, of the Mohammedan university-by-rote, of the cloistered monastery,

still too often overhangs school rooms and college halls. The attempt to pour knowledge into a student's head through a funnel, as you pour gasoline into a tank or water into a barrel—how hard it is to get away from that conception of education! The attempt to load up a student for life as we used to charge the old-fashioned muzzle-loading shotgun—we still keep at it in a breech-loading age.

Discipline in a schoolroom, why should we have discipline? The tortures to a child of sitting "in position," hands folded upon the desk and feet not touching the floor! Or standing lined up in a row along the wall "at attention." These barbarities still endure; and teachers still spend a great deal of their time in their institutes and conferences talking about "discipline." The most enlightened of elementary schools today are ridding themselves of the whole militaristic idea and introducing freedom, the normal behavior of human beings in a social environment. The table is taking the place of the desk; and an informal gathering round a table to undertake some project is taking the place of the old class. Children are allowed to whisper. Think of that, actually to whisper! What a revolution that signifies to some of us who in childhood were taught that whispering was just about in the same class with murdering. That ancient day is rapidly fading. The best schools operate with the utmost freedom, with the least possible amount of supervision and restriction upon the children. Order there must be, of course, as in all society, but a truly social order. What is called the project method, the turning

of the children loose to accomplish certain ends in their own individual ways, grows in favor and in use.

IV. MORE FREEDOM IN COLLEGES

The same spirit is increasingly applied to institutions of higher learning. The college and the university are shaking off the old-time methods of the funnel and the muzzle-loader. Gradually the principle which has long been put into words and seldom into practice, that education is a drawing out instead of a pouring in, an unfoldment or development instead of a stocking up, displaces ancient practice. Higher education, like everything else in our experimental age and country, is feeling its way toward new developments and is discontent with old cut and dried methods and atmosphere. James A. Garfield's aphorism that a log with Mark Hopkins at one end and a student at the other constitutes a college is at last beginning to sink into the comprehension of up-to-date educators. With all the piling up of magnificent buildings and endowments, with the addition of libraries, laboratories, art galleries, and observatories, we nevertheless comprehend increasingly that Mark Hopkins, the great teacher, cuts a larger figure in true education than all the material equipment. If one had to choose between a great institution without a teacher of genius, and a teacher of genius without a great institution, one would far better take the latter.

One college executive in this country at least has declared that he never intends to build handsome structures or to solicit funds for great equipment. He intends to look carefully all over the nation for magnetic teach-

ers—not necessarily famous men who have written books or made contributions to science or who have distinguished themselves as research hounds, but teachers, alluring, inspiring, charming; and then he intends to pay them handsomely according to their worth. Furthermore, he limits the size of his college to seven hundred, does not intend that it shall ever grow beyond that number, a certain percentage of them boys and a smaller percentage girls. Besides all this, he told me that he wished to abolish as rapidly as possible the old-time lecture method and the old-time text-book-and-quiz method in the college class room. He defined the lecture method as the transference of words from one set of notes to another by means of a fountain pen with as little intellectual effort as possible, and the quiz method as a sort of Sherlock Holmes procedure by which a professor sought to ascertain how little knowledge a student possessed. Instead of these antiquated methods, the classes at Rollins College in Florida, under the régime of Dr. Hamilton Holt, meet for two-hour periods, and sit down at tables with their professors, with books or apparatus scattered about over the table. There the class confers with the professor, with one another, with the books, or with their fountain pens, as impulse and interest may direct; they even get up and go without saying "by your leave," to the library after a reference, to the laboratory after some object of inquiry, to their room after memoranda, or wherever they please. There is no restraint or constraint. The atmosphere is purely one of informal interest and inquiry. In place of examinations, students prepare papers, wherever they please

to prepare them, with all the tools they care to use in the preparation; their attitude toward the subject, their interest in it and enthusiasm about it, is gauged rather than their knowledge of it. None of us knows very much about anything; and it is rather our interest and curiosity that count. Given these, we shall educate ourselves in the long run.

A man by the name of Dr. Alexander Meiklejohn got into a mixup at an old conservative New England college because of his new-fangled ideas and got himself fired from the presidency. Glenn Frank took him to the University of Wisconsin, gave him a building all to himself, a set of a dozen professors or so, and two hundred picked freshmen to experiment upon. Dr. Meiklejohn set out to make his little college inside of the big university a sort of "beloved community," to use the phrase of Josiah Royce. The community chose its own subject of study, fifth-century Athens, its politics, art, philosophy, literature, religion, and everything pertaining to this golden period of Greece. They studied nothing else the first year, but that meant that they studied nearly everything under the sun. The second year, they chose America. Imagine the parallel between these two civilizations that those young fellows could not help drawing! Here, too, the utmost informality of relationships between professors and students prevail, a sort of adaptation of the Oxford tutorial system, only carried to greater lengths.

Antioch College at Yellow Springs, Ohio, a little old institution founded by Horace Mann, fell into the hands of a hydraulic engineer, Arthur E. Morgan, who had

solved the flood problem at Dayton. When they asked him to become president of the college, he agreed on one condition, and that was that all the trustees and faculty should resign; then he went to work and built it all over again. He planned for a six-year course especially designed for students who desired to earn part or all of their expenses. Each student spends six weeks at the college and six at some factory or office or store within "Ford distance," in contact with the business world and earning some money. Students work in teams of two, one in college while the other holds down the job, and changing places with each other at week-ends six weeks apart. Relations exist between certain corporations and the college by which any student recommended for a position is accepted by the business house. Thus a double process of education goes on in the student's life, partly concerned with theory and partly with practice. The project method plays a part in much of the instruction; for example, one party of students in horticulture gave their attention to the task of developing a blueberry one inch in diameter. At last accounts, they had come within a quarter of an inch of the requirement, a pretty big blueberry at that!

The great teacher and the informal method! When it is recognized that the magnetic teacher is in demand, he will be developed. Somebody has declared that among the thousands of professors in American colleges, there are not five hundred who are expert teachers. The fault is in the system which demands research results, the printing of books and the gaining of fame as writers and scholars, instead of demanding the cultivation of such

personality as will first charm, then stimulate, then inspire the youth who come to the teachers' doors. Put a premium upon such magnetism and the response will appear. With all his faults as a martinet, there is something of these qualities, so greatly to be desired, in the German schoolmaster. He gives his personal attention to each individual child; he stands eagerly before the pupil who is struggling with his problem, feeling for his lost word, trying to see through a confused situation, until when the situation is solved, the teacher all but dances up and down in joy, may throw his arms around the boy and hug him in his delight. No pupil however backward can fail to respond to such sympathy and stimulation.

Something of that sort the colleges begin to seek. William Rainey Harper did such great teaching feats at Yale University in the late eighties of the last century; then he gave up his chair to become an executive and to build a great university in the west. He did it and died early; and one sometimes wonders whether all this practical endeavor was worth while in comparison with the exercise of his genius as a teacher. He had as dry a subject as any man ever had to impart to his fellow-men, the Hebrew language; yet he filled his study so full of inspiration and aspiration and enthusiasm on the part of his students that they worked for him four, five, six hours out of the twenty-four until all the rest of the professors in the divinity school were jealous of the amount of time that Harper took. That is the magnetic power upon which the colleges at last begin to put a premium.

Mass production may do very well in industry, but it will scarcely do finally and satisfactorily in education. For the most part, mass production, on account of the rapid increase of our numbers without a corresponding increase in our school funds, still holds the center of the stage. We grind children through the hopper of our primary and secondary schools, without regard to differences in temperament, taste, interest, or brain capacity. We try to turn them out all standardized, all built on the same model, like a cheap motor car as it slides off the assembly line. Some few superintendents and principals, making bricks without straw, are beginning to sort out the materials which come to them in the shape of little human lives and try tentatively to rank them according to native ability and inclination. Certain colleges carry the process further still. Not every freshman who enters college can attain the degree of B.A., B.S., or what not; not every freshman should go clear through to a degree at all; a college should set itself to answer the question as to what kind of degree, if any, the student should get.

Swarthmore College undertakes this discrimination; it presents two types of degree, the ordinary A.B. and "the A.B. with honors." At the end of the sophomore year, the students decide for themselves at which one they will aim. For the honors degree, they must set a certain academic standard in their first two years, and develop as well certain qualities of character, perseverance, trustworthiness, and determination, to show themselves fit to aspire. Then the honor student is allowed to select from ten to a dozen fields of study—not departments,

like Greek, mathematics, biology, but a whole wide field —covering many lines of human inquiry and looking toward a roundness and a breadth of intellectual development and character formation. The idea has attained success enough to be adopted at Princeton, Oregon, and several other American colleges.

V. STUDENTS TAKE A HAND IN MANAGEMENT

Increasingly educational institutions give students a chance to say something about the management of their own education. Self government has become an established principle in many of them, primary, secondary, and collegiate. President Hopkins, of Dartmouth, took away the breath of the educational world by asking the student body for criticisms of the curricula, the educational policies, and the ways and manners generally of the institution. The students took the matter seriously and intelligently, and offered suggestions which led to actual changes and improvements. At Harvard a commission of students which was asked to report concerning certain conditions, did so to such advantage that a benefactor donated eleven millions of dollars to carry out their recommendations. This gift, too, is designed for the building of a small college within the college, after the Wisconsin plan, and after the much older one prevailing in English universities. When certain Harvard alumni criticized the authorities for paying heed to students' suggestions, Professor Rollo Walter Brown replied that some of the best suggestions of policy had come from students themselves concerning the construction of this new college within the college.

Glenn Frank, president of the University of Wisconsin, has given *carte blanche* to students and students' publications to criticize freely and frankly their professors. They may list the names of their teachers, with descriptions of their courses and comments as to whether they are dry as dust or bright and stimulating and profitable. The result is that Glenn Frank may rock and reel in his position; but it is to be hoped that his trustees are men enough to see the value of his attitude and to stand behind him until the last gun is fired. Mediocrity and incompetence fear the honest voice of plain and trenchant criticism, but talent and originality are not afraid, provided only the authorities behind them will lend them honest and faithful support.

Educators begin to pay heed to the voice of youth. Supple and elastic minds, not yet set and hardened by age, may sometimes see with greater clarity than even the maturity of experts can attain. If William James strikes anywhere near the truth when he declares that new ideas cannot penetrate a brain over thirty-five years old, then certainly young people brought into contact with educational questions as a daily cause for pondering, may well reach judgments sounder and stronger than those which come from older and more cement-like minds. One who has intimately to do with a large student body would infinitely prefer to seek a verdict from a student, on any important moral issue at any rate, if not upon actually a matter of educational policy, than from any townsman outside the academic limits. The young student mind possesses a sensitiveness and a fresh, unspoiled outlook that does not characterize the rank and

file of the business and social world. It was townsmen who caused all the trouble in Tennessee, not students. It was townsmen who secured the discharge or suspension of an eminent psychologist and a sociologist at the University of Missouri over a questionnaire addressed to the student body; the sympathy of the students all held with the discharged professors.

Freedom of teaching, freedom of inquiry, is seldom if ever threatened by a student body; and since contact with young minds tends to preserve youth and elasticity in those most intimately associated with them, it is seldom if ever that academic freedom suffers at the hands of academic men. It is the townsman, the opinionated newspaper man, the business man, the alumnus, the meddlesome and fossilized preacher, that strikes at the liberties of education and inquiry. Left to students themselves, what the Germans call the *lehrfreiheit* and the *lernfreiheit,* the freedom of teaching and the freedom of learning, will never be in danger. These, any college or university that is true to its calling must preserve, or forfeit the proud name of college or university. These, the Protestant spirit has created; and for these, the Protestant spirit must do and die; for when these fail, then we revert to the traditionalism and authoritarianism against which we rebelled, we fall back into the pit from which we were digged.

VI. WHERE WILL THE PRESENT TREND LEAD US?

The logic of the Protestant spirit in America calls, then, not so much for more and bigger colleges and universities, but for better ones. Many of the leading insti-

tutions of learning are becoming too big, maybe even too rich; and they are not so good as they might be. Their methods smack too much of the market place and the industrialism which dominates American life. Surely, if anywhere, academic shades are the places when idealism and aspiration should triumph over materialism and commercialism. Instead of that, some of these huge student bodies organize themselves into armies of pep-boosters for athletics as a means of advertising, for all the world like the boosting stunts of civic clubs and chambers of commerce, newspapers and other industrial combinations. Indeed, some of these commercial organizations may well envy the concentrated advertising abilities of the modern educational institution. Such is the feeling uttered by such widely diverse critics as William Allen White, the publicist, and President Lawrence Lowell, of Harvard University.

Under the influence of the Protestant and scientific outlook, democracy grows apace in the world, whatever set-backs it may apparently have received of recent years; and education forms the backbone of a democracy. Other forms of government may survive without it; other forms may even do better without it; but a democracy cannot survive unless its people are enlightened, unless they know the truth which makes men free. More than that, education is intimately allied with religion; indeed, it is the selfsame thing. Principal Jacks of England is advocating as strongly as he can this identity and is declaring that the future of religion is dependent upon a profounder education. Religion may be said to be education raised to the highest power. Both are designed for

the enlightenment and the refinement of the mind, the heart, the soul; both stimulate aspiration and a divine discontent; both reach out after the unknown, the unseen, the spiritual; and both tend to grow impatient and even oblivious to the purely material.

Education, too, helps us to appreciate humanity and its real value and never to make false distinctions in classification. Only the uneducated can think of himself or his own as more important than other people and their own. The truly cultivated man or woman places all human life upon the same level of value. He knows, what ignorance does not know, that the same kind of hearts beat under coarse woolens as under fine silk, that the same emotions and aspirations, hopes, fears, longings, and griefs flourish under the flowing robes of the orient as under the stiff black coats of the west. Only the really cultivated, ancient or modern, can cry, "I am a man and nothing that pertains to humanity is foreign to me." Only a great and highly polished spirit can exclaim, "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free!" or, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

This is not to imply that education alone can save anybody's life, make one good, lead to the good life. The world has seen many highly educated scoundrels. Sometimes increased culture makes social adjustment more difficult; increased refinement often adds to the sensitiveness with which the individual impinges upon his world and therefore increases the strain of walking in the narrow path of social conformity and conventionality. Nevertheless, all things equal, it is true that unintelligent and ignorant conduct may be called immoral

conduct; sin is ignorance. As an old theologian, Dr. Harris of Yale, defined it, "sin is the attempt to realize the absurd"; or as Bertrand Russell puts it, the highest morals mean simply intelligent conduct. The enlightened person has a better chance, in proportion to his enlightenment, to make his conduct conform to the highest interests of society, because he sees the bearing of what he does upon the welfare of all others. More than that, he is liberated from ancient and inhibiting prejudices, so that he lives with a certain daring, lives dangerously, as Jesus did and all the great spirits of light and leading. Some there are, like Professor Edward Scribner Ames, who consider religion the attempt to realize in life the highest and best for human society; and the educated man can make wiser efforts in this direction than the untrained.

CHAPTER XII

Religion and Recreation

CHRISTIANITY in the early centuries absorbed something of the Greek spirit, its lightness, its love of whatsoever things are true, lovely, and of good report; then it promptly lost much of this atmosphere in the iron legalism that was Rome, and in the somber streams of thought that bore down upon the south of Europe from the cypress swamps and forests of the north. Christianity, at its beginning, took on an ascetic spirit that derives to a degree, no doubt, from the caves and camps of the Essenes and the Nazarites of the Dead Sea region and the mountains of Moab, but that was deepened by the savage sadness of primitive European tribes.

It is, of course, never an easy thing to analyze an atmosphere into its constituent elements; perhaps it is enough, therefore, simply to recognize that asceticism, self immolation, flagellations, and extreme poverty constituted the highest ideal of holiness for many centuries in Christian history. Even though the masses might eat, drink, and be merry, such joyousness was only tolerated and not encouraged by the church. Somberness was the synonym for sanctity. The religious life, when the ideal was halfway lived up to, wore the hair shirt, the rough robe, and the rope girdle.

With the Renaissance, the sunny atmosphere of

Greece came sifting back, obscured and over-clouded now and again, but gradually increasing; with the Reformation, a new-old joyousness came dancing into the forests of the north. Luther came eating and drinking; he even married and gave in marriage; he carried a Christmas tree sparkling with snow out of the moonlight into the little cottage of Catherine Von Bora for his children. Calvin promptly soured much of this milk of human happiness, and the Puritans soured even more. Progress, as we have seen, goes in waves and recessions, in pendulum-swings and pulsations, never steadily toward a fixed end. A great deal that was Greek invaded Elizabethan England, receded under James I and the Roundheads, came extravagantly back at the Restoration, and all but disappeared again under Victoria; but steadily ideals of lightness, brightness, and well-being grew even in untoward circumstances. Even the Puritans in their own home life laughed and sang and ate and drank more than we are accustomed to think they did. The present age, both in Europe and America, perhaps especially in America, is feeling after the beauty of the Greek ideal of life and seeking to combine it with a Christian ethic into what Dr. L. P. Jacks calls a restoration of the lost radiance of Christianity.

If modern Christian prophets, like Reinhold Niebuhr and Sherwood Eddy, preach a new asceticism, they contemplate nothing like a return to the caves of Engedi or the monasteries of the middle ages. They think, rather, of joyous and artistic plain living and high thinking, a normal and natural society with all the happiness of social contacts, the relaxation and the exuberance neces-

sary to wholesome living, and the attempt at the fullest expression in art, poetry, drama, architecture, music, everything pure, true, beautiful, and of good report. It is not less of living, but more of living, more intense and happy living, more Greek and Christian living, that they are thinking of, these new prophets, when they talk about a new asceticism. They preach and embody the principle so often spoken and so fully lived by Jesus, summed up perhaps most succinctly in his statement, "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath." In other words, all institutions, all observances, all practices of society must aim not at the subjection of man but at the development, the growth, the freedom, the best interests of man. Any institution, however dear, that by long usage and custom gets in the way of man and his growth must be shattered, like the Sabbath, and something better put in its place. Thus a Christian Lord's Day, conceived in the Greek-Christian spirit, rises instead of the Sabbath. This is but an illustration of numerous other steps toward restoring the lost radiance.

Whether due to the Protestant faith and logic, or whether due to the Renaissance and the far-off influence of Greece, or whether due simply to the evolution of human society, there appears in our period an evident attempt to explore the constitution of man and an evident desire to round out his being in as symmetrical a mode of living as can be found. Necessarily, in this attempt, attention has been paid, and must increasingly be paid, to rest, recreation, amusement. It has long been known that all work and no play turns Jack out a poor social product; but only recently have we begun to rec-

ognize that play is necessary to the adult, and to create a philosophy and a psychology of play. If human beings are to live out the allotted term, they must play as well as work; if they don't play, then they will take it out in drinking and in swearing and in warring. Only comparatively recently have we set about definitely to find out why they do such things.

I. THE PHILOSOPHY OF PLAY

Within the last fifty years or so, students have worked out various explanations of the tendency in human beings to play. Herbert Spencer held that play is the using of those organs and functions of the body that are over-rested and under-worked in the normal course of life; that it is the working off of a super-abundance of energy. This is good as far as it goes, but does not go far enough. Professor Groos, in two great volumes, sets forth the theory that play is a preparation for what is to be practiced later in the serious pursuits of life; thus girls play with dolls in preparation for motherhood, and boys play in contentious games in preparation for the contests of life. But this theory fails to explain the play of adults. Certain American writers have put forth a *catharsis* theory of play, that it is a kind of safety valve for the letting loose of pent-up emotions, as in the fighting plays of children and young people, where the pent-up emotion is anger. There is value to this idea also; undoubtedly play, both in children and adults, uses up the secretions of certain internal glands which, without this outlet, would have a poisoning effect upon the blood and nerves. There is the so-called recapitulation theory

of play, according to which the individual passes through all the stages of the evolution of the race—children run as their primitive ancestors ran to get away from danger; they throw sticks and stones for the same reason; they swing clubs and beat at balls or at one another as their savage fathers did before them. But here, too, there is lacking an explanation of the play of adults who, upon occasion, do the same things.

Possibly the best explanation of the play tendency is that summed up by Professor G. T. W. Patrick in *The Psychology of Relaxation*. He holds, with many other authorities, that civilization increasingly ties us down with inhibitions, repressions, conventions, which, in the nature of the case, enchain us and fatigue us. Play is an attempt to shake off for the time being these restraints; it is a reversion to previous conditions, more or less savage, at least unrestrained, which enable us to get rid of pent-up and repressed emotion, or, if you will, to get rid of the secretions of those ductless glands which have loaded us up, on account of our restrained emotion. Thus, grown men find infinite relief in getting out upon grassy slopes and swinging clubs fiercely at little white balls, then following the flight with piercing vision, then going to peer among long grasses and bushes just as their savage ancestors used to go and hunt for their arrows and missiles. As speed played an essential part in safety in war or in hunting with our savage ancestry, so speedy motion is a great relief and recreation to the civilized human being. Racing upon horses and rapid motion with automobiles and airplanes lets go taut nerves, quickens blood circulation, purifies the whole

nervous system. For a like reason, men love to fish, to camp, to splash in mud or water. Literally hundreds of thousands of people in great cities go out to streams, lakes, and seashores, spend large sums of money for equipment, catch fish or not as the case may be—and if they catch them, hand them over with great indifference to guides or to cooks—because the compensation is not in the fish but in the catching of the fish, the reversion to the activities of the wilderness and of their savage ancestry. A group of workmen from a factory swallow a hasty lunch and then go to a vacant lot, throw a ball back and forth, swing at it with a club, run from base to base, shout and make faces, doing the same sort of things that primitive men used to do with clubs, stones, and speed. The unthinking might say that these men were not resting, that they ought to be sitting in the shade quietly and storing up their energies. Not so. They are using an unused set of muscles and, what is more important, letting go pent-up emotions.

Thousands of people go to professional baseball games and watch eighteen men in two teams in a contest of strength, speed, and skill. Thoughtless persons often declare that those thousands of people are wasting money and time. Not so. They shout, grimace, and bawl out denunciations and cheer at players and umpires; they clap each other on the back, throw up their hats, and lose themselves and all their inhibitions and repressions in a return to the primitive audiences that surrounded heroes and warriors of old. Football games even more nearly approximate the warfare of organized tribes in ancient time; therefore, they attract all the bigger crowds

and all the more strenuous response. The game may cease to be a game for the players; it may become extremely hard work indeed; but to the spectators it brings unmitigated relaxation, recreation, rest. Wrestling and boxing bouts have the same value for those who attend them, and the dangers or cruelties are restricted by the regulations of the authorities. Automobile races, more dangerous than any of these other forms of spectacle, and airplane stunt flying and exhibitions, give the same sort of thrill to those who watch them—a kind of vicarious breasting of the danger. To consider that the hundreds of thousands of people who flock to such forms of entertainment are morons and nitwits is to take a short-sighted and unscientific view of the necessity for human relaxation.

The most stupendous form of such amusemental relief known to history appears in the games at the Coliseum in Rome and the races in the Circus Maximus. Humanity early had to fight the beasts for survival; and with immense joy the Roman populace watched gladiators fighting lions and tigers from Africa and India. Those emperors were most popular who brought the most games to the Coliseum. At one time eleven thousand wild beasts were collected and brought there for combat; and one season of games lasted for over a hundred and twenty days. Such extravagance of play does not destroy but rather demonstrates the truth of the principle that civilization brings restrictions from which now and then there must be some form of escape.

With the growth of civilization comes greater complexity in the tangled pathways through the brain and

greater increase of monotony and fatigue from the confinement to these paths. The more civilized the race, the more restrained and suppressed its evidences of emotion, and the more the face and bearing become set and formal. Primitive man, living in the open, spent most of his time upon his feet, walking, running, hunting, fighting, standing, and stalking enemies or game. Civilized man, on the contrary, increasingly sits down; muscles of trunk and legs that formerly were in constant use now seldom exert themselves. Swimming, walking, athletics, and dancing bring a necessary relief to these unused muscles. Folk dancing, such as the old-time square dance, rather than the more or less objectionable society dancing of today, is recommended by psychological scientists. Here lies the value of exaggerated jazz, the Charleston and other adaptations of the Negro jigs, breakdowns, and double-shuffles. The imitations of the Negro dances, flinging the body about with great abandon, especially serve a valuable end; for they are types of the folk dance, and bring all the dancers' muscles into play.

For the most sophisticated, and for those advanced in years, other forms of play may be substituted for these more vigorous ones. Games of cards, dominoes, checkers, and chess, bring relief from the mental tension and fatigue which increase with increasing civilization. The more informal the game and the less studious, the greater the value. Novels, poetry, drama, and art in all its forms brings rest, refreshment, and recreation. They restore the jaded spirit and are, therefore, spiritual in character and in value. A story read brings its benefit,

but a story told or enacted or sung to a social company brings multiplied benefit. Hence the value of the old traveling troubadour, the mission of the player, and the service of the story-teller. He is bringing release to tied-up nerves; he comes bringing laughter holding both his sides; he uses up the poisonous secretions of the endocrine glands which have had no outlet for the day or the week or the month. The theater has played a beneficent part for three or four centuries in modern civilization. Beginning at least with the Elizabethan era and the school of playwrights and players who preceded and surrounded Shakespeare, the stage play has rested and recreated many worn and tired minds and lives. Previously to this time, of course, plays had been produced in Christian lands, but largely by the church and largely of religious character. The old miracle plays and pageants occur to our minds; but nothing like the Greek theater had flourished in Europe at large until the Protestant Reformation came on. All forms of legitimate drama, from farce and comedy to the most dignified tragedy, perform not only the function called *catharsis,* but even more, lift us out of ourselves, enable us to live in imagination the events depicted upon the stage and discharge the pent-up emotions and gland secretions in a kind of vicarious fashion.

II. LAUGHTER HOLDING BOTH ITS SIDES

The recreation which comes from laughter, all experts seem to agree, performs a part of the utmost wholesomeness in human life. Advancing civilization compels us among other restraints to repress our laughter, especially

loud and explosive laughter. The faces of the fully civilized become set in restrained lines, carved like stone; and to laugh loudly and uproariously in polite society violates good form. Anything that releases us from this state of repression and forces us, almost against our wills, to burst into loud guffaws, relieves momentarily the restrained and inhibited brains and emotions. The origin of laughter has occupied students of psychology of late; and the study has resulted in a theory somewhat as follows: Primitive man, engaged in war or the chase, moving stealthily and watchfully, his face frozen into hard lines, suddenly triumphs over his foe; he stands gloating above the prostrate form, and emits a sudden explosive breath of relief with the syllable "Ha!" followed by a succession of explosive breaths, a wild, loud series of ejaculations, as much as to say, "I have triumphed. I am alive. You, my enemy, are dead. I've got the best of you." Almost all other moments of quick relief from anxiety and strain, from repression and inhibition, are followed by the same explosive syllable or series of syllables. Today, though dangers are reduced, the restraints remain; and anything that releases us, perhaps suddenly and unexpectedly, from the grooves of habitual restraint causes the same series of explosive ejaculations of relief. That is why almost anything a little out of the ordinary is so funny in a dignified environment, in a school or a church or at a funeral. A public speaker is a poor jokester indeed who cannot suddenly release laughter in a large and dignified audience. That is why it is the easiest possible way to break the ice between an audience and a speaker who are

strange to each other. Professor Patrick says, "Laughter is more than salutary; it is necessary. Wit, humor, and laughter are shock absorbers. They alone enable us to stand the pace and save our nerves from disaster."

III. UNWHOLESOME RECREATION

Profanity, alcohol, drugs, and war have all been studied as manifestations, in an unwholesome and misdirected fashion, of ways by which man has sought to escape the fatigues of restraint. Profanity relieves the speaker through the sense of shock that he is trying to give to his hearers. The more sacred the words employed, the greater the shock, the greater the sense of unconventional release. Joan of Arc, in Mark Twain's biographical novel, gets a great deal of amusement out of her dealings with the profane General LaHire. She commands him to cut out his swearing and go to mass, and finally compromises with him by granting permission that in battle he may swear by his baton, the symbol of his command. Alcohol, we now know, is not a stimulant but a narcotic; it puts to sleep the higher brain centers, gives them a false and temporary release from the grooves of sophistication. Drugs give the same reaction; and the greater the civilization, the stronger the temptation to the use of them.

War upsets the current of civilized life and behavior; it lets loose the primitive in man, both in those young men who go to war and in those old men who stand on the sidelines and shout and curse their enemies. Many men welcome war as a release from the restrictions of civilization. During the World War, a great many

young men went gladly into camp and into battle to get rid of the oppressions of conventionalized life, domestic and otherwise. A letter was sent through the hands of the censor in France by a young soldier to his wife at home, who had been upbraiding him about the irregularity of his remittances. He said, "Can't you leave me alone and quit your nagging, and let me enjoy this war in peace?" Professor Patrick speaks of war as "a return to the most brutal and the most elemental kind of behavior, which rests the higher brain completely. It is really a psychological situation that the peace societies have to contend with. Mankind cannot so easily escape from its long past." This utterance gives point to the search of William James for "a moral substitute for war." Civilized society must devise means of explosion for mankind, short of the barbarities of war, through games, through play, through the stage and the motion pictures, through literature and the arts, through the inventions and anything and everything that will relieve the tense nerves and the tired brains of sophisticated peoples without the organized murder of one another.

IV. RELIEF IN BEAUTY AND TRUTH AND GOODNESS

Increasingly it dawns upon the consciousness of religious thinkers that every form of spiritual cultivation and relief in the beautiful, the true, and the good—that old-fashioned trinity—must be fostered for the salvation of the individual and of society. A new significance and content come into the word "spiritual" with this attitude of mind. Too long in Protestantism, in the so-called evangelical sects, this beautiful word has been

abused as applying to certain cant phrases and shibboleths, certain holy tones and whines, certain sect observances and conventionalized prayings, rather than to the upper range of aspiring existence, to the delight and the refreshment that come from every form of artistic expression. Some Protestants could never think of Aristophanes' comedy *The Frogs* as spiritual, or the *Antigone* of Sophocles, or the statue of the Apollo Belvidere, or the Propylaeum, or the Parthenon. Possibly they might think of these buildings as spiritual—they are so grand, and they cannot be seen without some exaltation; yet it is doubtful if the average orthodox Christian who cants about spirituality—usually pronouncing it "spirichality"—could ascend to the Acropolis and regard his stand there as a high religious experience. Yet in all probability, Paul, who dictated so much of the theology of conventional Protestants, could perform this incredible feat; possibly he had the Acropolis in mind, and maybe the red roofs of Tarsus, the Hippodrome at Antioch, and the other great works of art in the Graeco-Roman world, when he advised his followers to think about "whatsoever things are beautiful, pure, lovely, and of good report."

The love of nature is spiritual. There are very few who do not have it; there are none who cannot cultivate it; the artistic inspiration and relief that it brings are nothing less than boundless. Paul possessed little of it; at least he never illustrates in all his voluminous writings from the beauty and the sweetness of nature; perhaps that is why so many Protestants have seemed oblivious to it. There are, however, some signs of a

change, and an increased delight on the part of western peoples in the loveliness with which the good God has surrounded them. Civilization shows some indications of a desire to refine the beauty, and increase it, of the natural world in which they live. The creation of gardens and forests, the conservation of waterfalls and rivers, the ornamentation of lakeside drives and mountain parts—is there something here which may play a part in the moral substitute for war? Nature appeals to memory, brings back the days and nights of romantic youth, induces a sweet melancholy, and even in some moments and some phases releases tears; here is direct relief from repressions, sophistications, conventions. With Nature one may be himself; and for his variant moods she speaks a variant language.

What is true of Nature may be true of what we call art, the product of man's hand and brain as he seeks, not so much to copy Nature, as to reproduce the same responses and emotions that Nature can so readily call up. All that is art which, by one form or another of expression, stirs the human soul, lets loose the explosions of the human nerves, consumes the stored-up secretions due to inhibited reactions. Drawing, painting, building, writing, singing, acting—these and various other forms, artistic expression takes. Nor need the expression be always beautiful—sometimes it is terrible, just as Nature in certain of her moods is terrible, awe inspiring, terror striking. Pictures need not always be beautiful to be art. Hogarth reproduced the life of the submerged tavern roysterers and drunkards, the scum of London. Was his work any the less art? Eugene O'Neil pictures the seamy

side of American life, strips conventional man to the bone, shows us what goes on around us whether we like it or not. Is it any the less art because it is forbidding? Must the story always be pretty, sweet, filled with the perfume of honeysuckle and the softness of moonlit nights? Must the story always end in a way that we call well, in which everyone lived happily ever afterward? When we make these demands, as the American public seems prevailingly to do, we merely reveal our own low state of artistic culture. The Greeks made no such demands; otherwise we should never have had Homer and Aeschylus and their descendants, Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare, Milton. The greatest art is seldom merely pretty.

The most spiritual thing that the most progressive nations could do, and the best substitutes for drunkenness, profanity, and war, were to bend their whole energies and to spend all their substance in the production of great works of art. Battleships are not beautiful in any artistic way, but egregiously ugly and highly inartistic, except when belching broadsides. Turn those millions into glorious sky-scraping public structures, cover them with carvings, fill them with paintings, and what a release for pent-up emotions they could provide! Instead of subsidizing armies and navies, subsidize the artists now starving in garrets or making their music for a bare subsistence. Give them leisure, time for thought and culture; take away their anxieties for mere food and clothing for themselves and their families; honor them with positions, recognition, opportunities; and how the face of the western world would change from grimness into smiles! There is money enough and to spare, now

spent on armaments actuated by fear, which, if changed to the uses of artistic production, which is not unprecedented among classic nations, might change Europe and America into long avenues of beauty, tree-lined highways, a very elysium of spiritual joy. Of course, it will take a long time to realize such idealistic dreams. It can never come in answer to the whinings and the cants of Protestant extremists; they don't know what spirituality is. It can only come through the long toil of thinkers and dreamers who will have spent themselves, often in obscurity and penury, to find out the truth and to tell it.

Protestantism must bear the odium of long ages of denunciation directed at perfectly harmless types of diversion, yes, necessary types of relaxations, such as cards, dancing, theaters, boxing, football, fishing on Sunday, and golf-playing. These things all minister, in one way or another, each in its own way, to spirituality. It is undoubtedly true that "when the human race learns to do without sleep and rest, when it learns to work both day and night, only then may we dispense with laughter, with play, with art, and with religion."

The Protestant world is at last trying, more or less blindly and painfully, to bring about realization of the ideals here set forth. In America, in particular, it would seem that a wistful sort of search is going forward after an idealism compounded of two elements: first, the Greek devotion to beauty and well-being, to joy and radiance; and, second, the ethics of Christianity. The combination of these two strains, upon careful reflection, seems not at all unattainable. They are not incompat-

ible. Some observers have sensed in America a kind of sadness and a measure of anxiety for tomorrow, which has reflected itself in our literature and even in our laughter; and yet even that anxiety, perhaps, is having its desire answered in the increased and increasing well-being and comfort, in the means of expression and recreation, which characterize our national life. Even though the pains of travail may accompany the birth of this ancient Greek ideal, the consummation may be worth all the preliminary agony. Certainly some progress makes itself manifest. The sadness is not quite so apparent as it was two or three decades ago. It may be that the wish is father to the thought, but something of a new calm, a new carelessness, if you will, seems to be coming up over the horizon; a new contentment seems to manifest itself in less of social striving, of economic war and contention, in more of satisfaction in the beauties of the world and of art and the essential goodness of life.

Along with this Greek sense of well-being—which, after all, is much the same as the lost radiance of Christianity, the joy which the Nazarene teacher said he wished to leave with his people—there comes naturally and inevitably the solution of human relations set forth in the ethics of the founder of the Christian religion. We are coming to see that his solution is in harmony with the best findings of modern science. He seemed to understand the need for release and relief from the conventions of the law which surrounded him. He loved to get away in boats and into the loneliness of the mountains and wild places; he loved social converse, dinners and weddings and house parties. He loved the architecture of

classic Capernaum and the oriental beauty of the temple area. There was nothing of somberness and melancholy, let alone pessimism and fatalism, either in his personal bearing or in his ethical precepts. Modern psychology and modern economics are slowly finding out that his relaxed ease in social contacts and social views are the best solution for our own complicated age. Indeed, whether you regard all the elements which go to make up his figure in the world's thought as historical or only as ideal, he is none the less the embodiment of the double ambition, unconscious though it may largely be, of the American people, to find and to restore the lightness, the carelessness, the relaxed joy, and the sense of well-being of golden Greece, and at the same time the simple beauty of the Christian morality in the Golden Rule and the Sermon on the Mount.

CHAPTER XIII

Mysticism

MYSTICISM is difficult enough to understand and still more difficult to define. It derives from the Greek word *mysterion,* which means a secret religious ceremony. In Greek usage, therefore, a mystery was something which must not be revealed, must be kept secret; in modern usage it has come to apply to something which cannot be revealed because it is not understood. All that we do not know or cannot explain belongs, therefore, to the realm of mystery. Life, we say, is surrounded by mystery, shot through with mystery. "Mystic" and "mystical" apply, then, to those persons and those attitudes of mind which acknowledge a borderland between the known and the unknowable, a misty circumference beyond the region of sense perception or of reasoning. Here intuition reigns, or faith, or a conviction obtained in some other way than by the two well-known means of knowledge, sense perception and intellectual processes. Mysticism has been defined, as Professor Knight Dunlap of Johns Hopkins points out, as "the belief in a third kind of knowledge."

The mystical element has always made itself felt in religious life. It early appeared in Christianity and powerfully affected its train of thinking and manner of living. The Greek world into which Christianity was early projected vitally influenced the thought and the

spirit of the new religion, as is clearly seen in the fourth gospel, perhaps the favorite gospel of the largest number even of modern Christians, and in other writings of the New Testament. Recognition of the mystery and the beauty, perhaps the beauty of the mystery, that like a rosy cloud constituted the penumbra surrounding human life, worked its way into the theology of the unknown author of that fourth gospel, and even to a degree into the work of Paul. Greek thought, in turn, doubtless felt the effect of Indian strains of influence, for we know that certain of the great teachers in the golden age of Greece, like Plato, journeyed eastward to bring back from the Orient the gold of the philosophy woven into the Vedic hymns, the Sankhya, and the Vedanta, of ancient Hindu thought. These eastern strains can be discerned even in the neo-Platonic philosophy of Alexandria, in the systems of such men as Plotinus, perhaps chiefly Plotinus, who is a sort of god-father to the modern mystic.

Through the long centuries in which Roman Catholicism represented Christian thought, the mystic element in religion flourished and was carefully fostered. The withdrawal of holy men to live hermit lives, or at least monastic lives, made directly for the development of the mystic attitude in life and religion. The mortification of the flesh, the hair shirt, the bed of spikes, the fast, the pebbles in the shoes, all this was designed to promote those states of trance or semi-consciousness in which visions might appear and the devotee might behold the invisible. The words of such saints and holy people, both men and women, have come down to us,

conveying, to be sure, no very clear and definite impression of the things seen and heard. The words and phrases used by mystics in all religions bear a striking resemblance, such as ecstasy, the indescribable, the ineffable, union with the infinite, unity with the God, marriage with the Lord. Such attempts to put into words that which cannot be uttered come down even from our savage ancestors.

Some of them induced the trance by eating certain herbs or nuts, like the mescal, or by drinking certain intoxicating drinks. Nobody can describe the beautiful dreams, the ineffable happiness, which come to the drug addict or the drunken man. Something of this ecstatic state could be produced by brooding in monasteries and nunneries, no doubt, by starvation and bodily weakness and abnormal physical conditions of any kind. The fact that so large a portion of the utterances of mystics may in all probability be traced to such causes lends color to the statement of those students of psychology and of philosophy who would reduce all the mystical in human thought and emotion to purely sensory conditions. Professor Edward Scribner Ames, for example, in the chapter on mysticism in his volume called *Religion*, finds no other source for this element in religion except nerves and glands and other sensuous origins. The mystics themselves, however, even though they may repudiate the word "mysticism" and refuse to be classed with any ism or school, remain unconvinced by the rationalists and insist that "there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in your philosophy, Horatio."

I. ASCETICISM NOT NECESSARY TO THE MYSTIC

With the coming of Protestantism, the ascetic ideal of holiness fell to the ground. Luther came with a robust cheeriness into the religious life of the western world, contending both by precept and example that life itself, with all its experiences of joy and pain, of happiness and sorrow, furnished sufficient discipline for the spiritual existence. In his belief, the home and family could foster ecstatic states; social life and relationships could induce the moods of exaltation; and faith alone produced that condition which might fitly be termed, in its joy and peace, salvation. John Wright Buckham says concerning Luther: "It was his wholesome and manly piety that enabled him to see that the devout and self-denying facing of common life with its toil and trial, its searching tests and temptations, is the best and truest possible purgation. But Luther only half succeeded in inculcating this truth. The lesson has been slow in learning. It is strange that with the example and teaching of Jesus, reproduced in Paul, so sun-clear in this respect, the ascetic ideal could ever have gained so firm a hold on Christianity. Even in Protestantism, in a modified form the ascetic ideal has been incorrigibly persistent."

It is easy enough for mysticism to run amuck, for the mystical to run away with the rational. In all times and in all religions this seems to have happened. It happens today. In the chaotic condition of a period of transition, the tortured minds of many who will not or cannot think, who have not the tools with which to think, who have not the guidance of trained and expert minds, too often take refuge in strange cults that

come directly or indirectly from the Far East whence early mysticism came to Greece. We have our theosophies and our yogis, our denials of matter and evil, our shutting of the eyes to the most ordinary facts of life, particularly all its ills, in a sort of dreamland of unreality. The newspapers are full of announcements of esoteric lectures and lecturers. Anybody can get an audience who proclaims a non-understandable system or lack of system clothed in incomprehensible language. The poor deluded public eats it with a spoon. The more mysterious and mystifying the message, the more the public goes away with its head in the rosy clouds and its feet off the earth. But if every error is a truth abused, and if at the heart of every husk of mistake there is a sound kernel of honest truth, then we may avoid the necessity of throwing away all the mystical in religion, all the realm of faith and wonder, just because some extremists run amuck. There is no use to empty out the baby with the bath. Here, if anywhere, is opportunity for discrimination.

There are mystics and mystics. One may be mystical in one degree, and another mystical in another degree. Mystics and the mystical may exist without a mysticism. The ism is not essential to the situation. Names of the utmost respectability, of the calmest intellectual poise, teach us that mystics may keep their feet firmly on the ground even though their eyes may be turned outward toward the circumference of mist that surrounds all human life. Men of the scientific era, not lacking in the scientific spirit, informed upon all the bearings of the question, may be numbered among the mystics, from

William James to Dean Inge, Joseph Fort Newton, and Rufus Jones. Indeed, far the majority of men, possibly without knowing it, belong in the ranks of the mystical quest, the wistful and yearning quest after the Unknown God. Some of us call it longing and others call it God. From the days of Paul, who recognized the Athenians as searchers after God, on down to the nature lovers and art lovers and religion lovers of the present day, men have ever felt after him if haply they might find him. And how is it unscientific to say that perhaps emotion plays as much a part as cold reason in reaching definite and sure conclusions about him? How is one to draw the line between what is known or at least believed by intuition, and what is grasped by more purely intellectual processes? Who can tell except the one who prays whether his prayers are answered in some satisfying way or no? How can one deny the varieties of religious experience? Easy enough to dismiss all the multiplied testimony concerning direct contacts between the human heart and the Eternal Being back of the world, and to trace it all to emotional states due to the functioning of endocrine glands or the condition of the nerves; but when you have done this, you have pushed the inquiry but one step further back. For what is it that causes nerves and glands to function in a particular way at a particular time? And why does an emotional response, given the same conditions, come to one and not to another, unless it be that the one has fitted himself by training and by seeking for the very response which he obtains?

II. WHO CAN DEFINE THE LOVE OF BEAUTY?

The love of the beautiful, the artistic, the noble, and the good, stirs every soul first or last; and it cannot be rationalized away. Neither can it be explained in any intellectual terms that we have yet found. We do not explain it when we say that it is a purely sensuous reaction to stimuli. The question grows only intenser. Why are we made to respond? Why is beauty and goodness here in the first place? That power which built the earth and all the stars about it, little speck of dust that it is, filled it full of beauty and goodness and nobility; and the heart of man leaps up in response to it, is moved and stirred deeply at the sight of it, and answers, with a longing and an aspiration that nothing can quench, to the order, the law, the regularity, and the resultant beauty by which he is surrounded. Sometimes poets and artists see more clearly and more truly than even philosophers; and they have believed in large numbers that after all religion may be reducible to terms of beauty. Even in Christianity we may not have come so far as we think away from ancient Greek ideals and the Greek religion of beauty. Before we are through we may even go back more consciously than we have ever done to the love and worship of the beautiful along with the true. It would seem that the intellect alone does not fully satisfy.

Dean Inge, a Protestant, lists the characteristics of mystical religion as follows: First, a disinterested quest of the absolutely real and good and beautiful; a quest of the Absolute; the goal is God himself—the Unchanging, Eternal Fountain of all being. Second, the mystic

stakes all to gain all; he gives his whole self, because if anything is kept back the quest is vain. Huxley once said, "It does not take much of a man to be a Christian, but it takes all there is of him." Third, strenuous labor, though the labor is mostly internal. Fourth, although the journey is through darkness to light, and although "all truth is shadow except the last," yet there is immediacy all through, contact with the divine, which even the sin wherewith the face of man is blackened cannot quite extinguish. Fifth, the goal is a living object of love, a God who draws souls like a magnet. Sixth, beatitude is a form of enriched and enhanced life, not nothingness, not Nirvana, but peace bathed in love; this is the aim of the mystic and his path is a dying life, not a living death. Such is the Protestant, as opposed to the old monastic, ideal of the mystical in religion.

III. THE RATIONALIST VERSUS THE MYSTIC

If, however, we push the rationalistic campaign against the mystical element in religion to its utmost conclusion, as some in the twentieth century seem to do, God disappears into a personification of the various social stages in human progress, the summation of each varying mood or condition of tribe or nation; immortality becomes only living in the memory of those who are still alive; prayer is reduced to an intellectual calisthenics which one feels all the time is not worth while; and religion, to put it in the language of those who go this length, must be defined as humanism, or naturalism. This extreme position of certain intellectuals among the Protestants of today leads to a coldly scientific pursuit

of the economic and physical welfare of man, with perhaps some attention to intellectual and aesthetic development, and to a frank and definite seeking for happiness alone as the end and aim of life; it results in barren futility in many Protestant churches of the present era. Even Dr. Ames, who takes the rationalistic position upon this matter of the mystical element in religion, writes several trenchant paragraphs directed at naturalism, or humanism. He holds that the error in this position arises from the abolition of one term of a dualistic conception while retaining the other. The contrast between the supernatural and the natural cannot logically be solved by simply dropping the term supernatural. Neither can the contrast between the human and the superhuman be so easily disposed off. Speaking of the advocates of humanism, he says:

"Convinced that the empirical values are the only values discoverable, they conclude that this justifies their naturalistic, humanistic interpretation of the world. They are therefore compelled to devote much of their strength to denying the existence of God and the supernatural. But as a result, they are left with a truncated world, and the lower half of the old dualistic order. They have unwittingly separated man from nature by the same stroke, and have left their humanistic realm suspended between the void of matter on the one side and the vacancy left on the other by the removal of the old supernaturalistic deity. . . . Desires for more adequate living arise out of the conflicts occurring in the partial and imperfect adjustments of the organism; conceptions of means for attaining more satisfying condi-

tions appear, and these are embodied in attempts to reconstruct the ways of life. It is these ideals, springing from blocked desire, which have been hypostatized into entities of another order. The misunderstanding of them gave rise to the contrast between the natural and the supernatural, and the error cannot be corrected by assuming a static realm of physical nature on the one side, and man as a helpless dreamer in an alien world on the other."

This matter strikes to the root of the old question of the existence of a God. The empiricism of today, that is, the method of examining facts, co-ordinating them, and drawing necessary conclusions from them, has swept away the conventional forms of proof for the existence of a personal God. The old argument from design, for example, has practically gone by the board. Neither will the modern scientific mind admit as evidence the individual and personal testimonies concerning a mystical contact with the divine. It is true, as James H. Leuba in *The Psychology of Religious Mysticism* points out, that from end to end of the Protestant world these "inner experiences" constitute the only argument actually relied upon for the belief in a God in affective and intellectual relations with man; and that, if there is no other ground of belief, then for those who are acquainted with the modern scientific conceptions, there could be no belief in God. But as he further points out, philosophy knows another route, a metaphysical route, to the belief in God; and so long as there is any route at all, the human mind, however untutored, will find its way into that path and reach that conclusion. There is some-

thing after all to the mere universality of such belief. The world has few or no atheists, nor has ever had; and the mere fact that the chief reliance of the masses for proofs of the divine are in the emotional and mystical realm does not entirely exclude from their mental processes the profounder, even if only half-conscious, progress by means of a sort of innate philosophy. Mystical or metaphysical though the route be, every man travels one or the other of the two and reaches much the same goal, a god and a religion.

This is far from holding that religion has little or nothing to do with straight, hard thinking; far from declaring that it doesn't make much difference what you think but all the difference in the world how you act. In the individualism and the freedom of the modern atmosphere, the temptation is strong for the crowd to feel and to show its impatience with theology in favor of some form of practicality; easy for it to brush aside the tedious steps leading to knowledge and to turn its face to the instant need of things. How often do we hear the expression, "Makes no difference what you think; the important thing is how you live." Thus the crowd forgets that what you think determines how you live. Religion, like everything else in the social structure, cannot dissolve into a nebulous chaos of unthinking or wrong-thinking individuals and hope to hold society together, let alone lift it up into more skilful and artistic living. Not sentimentalism, not a dissolved emotionalism, but as straight and as square and as coherent a system of philosophy as our enlightenment can muster for us, is what we need. The exaggerations and the

dangers of the mystical elements in the human constitution need constant watchfulness, if we are to keep our feet on the ground.

Undoubtedly the "will to believe" affects our thinking, or, at any rate, the power to believe. We believe what we want to believe; and we believe what we cannot help believing. Perhaps the two things come to the same in the end. One cannot say, "Go to, I will believe this or that"; on the contrary, one believes what all his past inheritance and environment compel him to believe, and he cannot get away from it, rationalize how he will. No thought or idea or belief exists for us except as it has entered into us and become a part of us. The teacher, philosopher, friend, or guide, may insist to us that such and such is the truth and even demonstrate it, and still it does not become our truth until we appropriate it and it enters into our fiber. Possibly here is where the nervous system and the endocrine glands enter in, helping us to believe or to disbelieve, as the case may be. Are they not, then, as much a part of us as the convolutions of the brain, or whatever it is with which we do our thinking and knowing?

Some thorough-going psychologists insist that since the mystical states, the trances and the ecstasies, may be produced and are produced by drug, intoxicant, fasting, or fever, therefore all mystical states are traceable to purely sensuous and physical conditions. Is it not unscientific to declare that just because certain things are in some instances causes of certain states, that therefore there can be no such states except for such causes? Empiricism itself would teach us otherwise; for we know

that similar states, possibly not so intense but none the less real, may result from other causes. For example, one who has been trained to some love and appreciation of nature stands looking at some wonderful scene, Mont Blanc, Mt. Rainier, the Grand Canyon, the sunrise or sunset over any farm, the mistiness of the early dawn, and the silvery mystery of the moonlight, and feels a stir within him sometimes as powerful as that from the use of any drug or intoxicant. One trained even in the rudiments of art stands before Michelangelo's "Moses" or "David," or the ruins of the Parthenon, or DaVinci's "Last Supper," and a nameless yearning too deep for words comes welling up within him just as real as the mystic ecstasies that come to the flagellated monk in his cell or his cave. Some noble deed—the daring of a Lindbergh plunging out alone, first one of all, betting his life on a great adventure and coming out to win—stirs the whole world of humanity with cold chills up and down their backs, tense, taut nerves, and even tears and sobs, for all the world like the intoxication that comes from heavy drinking. Science and philosophy must take account of these human phenomena.

IV. HOW DIVIDE BETWEEN EMOTION AND REASON?

Who shall say that these aesthetic emotions, these artistic responses, these yearnings for the heroic and the noble, may not be part of the equipment with which we gain a rounded knowledge of life and of the world? Who shall draw the line in any human being between cold rationality and warm emotionalism? Who shall say how much every one of us is rationalist and how

much mystic, how much philosopher and how much poet, how much scientist and how much artist? We are so compacted of a variety of powers, thoughts, feelings, yes, intuitions if you will, that there is no scalpel keen enough to dissect the human constitution. Hence man as artist, man as poet, man as worshiper, may be just as truly man at his highest and best as man as thinker. Dr. William Ernest Hocking, himself a mystic although a philosopher, in *The Meaning of God in Human Experience,* has this to say concerning such worshipers, "They do not mix well, these mystics: they must live as objects to the crowd, solitary often, often in exclusive groups of like-minded spirits. . . . It is this difficulty of communication, this separation from the mass in thought and habit, this embarrassment of speech, which has embodied itself in the word *mysticism*. . . . It matters not to us if some, or even most, prophets have been vain or false, *if there are any true prophets.* In this, as in other great matters, nature makes a thousand failures to bring forth one consummate product. The existence of the genuine mystic—Bernard, Mohammed, Lao-tse, Plotinus, Eckhart, John of the Cross—however seldom he is found, is the momentous thing. . . . For the mysteries and the mystics have in the course of time distilled into their own tradition the essence of religious practice. They know, if any know, how it is that the knowledge of God can be the most universal of perceptions, and at the same time the most rare and difficult. They know wherein the act of prayer differs from an act of reflective thought. A philosophy of mysticism would be a philosophy of worship."

The united voice of humanity, then, emotional though it may be, explainable to a degree even as a form of sensuous response to stimuli, need not imply delusion, may even be the voice of authority. At all events, it is the only authority we have, the only guide we possess, and it cannot be altogether and forever wrong. Perhaps we shall find that the ancient Greek, who knew so much else, may have known what he was talking about when he summed up religion as the love of beauty. Maybe that is about the best that any of us can do, for beauty includes so much. To reduce religion to mere humanism, to define it as seeking and serving the best interests of humanity, leads often to the comparative barrenness of what is called the "social gospel." Too often this practical religion fritters itself away into certain types of "welfare work" and the promotion of mere institutions, mere administration and machinery. It leaves too many of us cold, and doubtful of its abiding value. There is no reason why a religion of beauty might not combine with a practical message of human welfare without becoming exclusively the one thing or the other. In point of fact, the poet and the humanitarian belong together in one. To believe with George Santayana that religion is rather a form of poetry, a symbolic interpretation of human experience, a great imaginative structure reared to extend the narrow horizons of actual living, that it is a high and noble form of art, a poem of the ages, does not clash with the view of Ames that "religion is the quest for the largest and the fullest satisfaction of felt needs. . . . It is in religion more than anywhere else that men realize their common

life, their brotherhood, their mutual dependence." The poetic spirit of a religion of beauty does not jar with the prophetic spirit of a practical one. There is room in such a quest as that of religion for the poet, the artist, the dreamer, and for the flaming prophet who would tear down ancient wrong and erect a fairer social structure.

We come back once more to what the American people, at least, seems engaged upon, which is the combination of the classic Greek aspiration for a religion of beauty and well being with the ethic of Jesus. The two mix well; they are by no means mutually exclusive. To live the rich, round, full life, as well adjusted to environment as may be, the satisfying life, the joyous, fully expressive life, and at the same time to fulfill the one and only command that Jesus gave, to love all things and all men, both great and small, lies altogether within the scope of any human career. The whole man may become absorbed in this inspiring pursuit. To cultivate himself as opportunity may allow in the appreciation of the beautiful in nature, in sculpture, in painting, in architecture, in poetry and drama, in literature in all its forms; to train himself in the artistic and poetic pursuit of prayer, of worship, of aspiration after all truth, all uplift, all the mysterious response which may come to him from the voices of the earth and air; and to keep his feet firmly set in the paths of love and good will and service to his fellow-man, this is surely the high and beautiful calling of the leading free, Protestant spirits in religion in our day.

CHAPTER XIV

The Growth of Nationalism

ALTHOUGH it is a difficult thing to trace and to prove, nevertheless there is a feeling among historical students that the rise of modern nationalism is somehow connected with the rise of Protestantism. The national spirit had, of course, grown and developed to a degree even in primitive times, and had flourished in certain instances in classical antiquity; but the widespread prevalence of national feeling and intense patriotism, difficult as it may be for us to realize it, has grown up over most of the world in recent centuries. Whether the Reformation gave birth to the nationalistic spirit or nationalism to the Reformation, one may not categorically declare; but that the two arose simultaneously one cannot gainsay.

Humanity is by nature gregarious; human beings cling together. If only for safety's sake, they early ascertained that they must hang together or hang separately. Against the dangers of the wilderness and the dangers of ferocious neighbors, primitive men had to stand together. Like flocks of sheep or herds of deer, they congregated for safety; and like packs of wolves, they got together to hunt and to make war. It is difficult for the imagination to go backward to a time when tribes did not exist. Then gradually tribes amalgamated into larger and larger communities, as the nomadic way of life gave place to

settled agricultural pursuits. From these aggregations of tribes, no doubt, sprang the first attempts at national life. Israel, for example, with her twelve united tribes, early developed a strong and persistent sense of nationalism, which has lasted to the present time.

Egypt, Assyria, Persia, one after another, attained national consciousness, a patriotism and a coherence, which must have been considerable in order to result in the achievements which we know were theirs. Greece under Alexander gained the same nationhood, and preserved it for many centuries during her great golden era. It was in this time that she built her temples, carved her statues, made her plays, and wrought out her philosophies. Then, divided by jealousies between Athens and Sparta, she disintegrated to her decay. The Romans came next, emerging gradually from the tribal state into a national consciousness with her increasing victories and her wide-flung boundaries. Although but a very few of her population could be called citizens, nevertheless the way was open for any slave, sufficiently able, to work his way up to Roman citizenship. Many did, and the number of those endowed with the franchise increased with the ripening of her history and civilization. Her roads were unrolled like wide white ribbons from the golden mile-stone in the Forum at Rome. They were patroled by her legionaries and rendered safe for all travelers by night and day, summer and winter. Her ships sailed the Mediterranean to what were then the ends of all the earth. Her invincible armies added territories farther and farther away from the capital, bringing back spoil and captives, adding to her splendor, her

circuses, and her bread. An intense national pride grew up, even among the serfs and slaves, the heavy fractions of the population which were submerged beneath the real Roman citizenry. Roman law, Roman order, Roman grandeur, these things thrilled the breasts even of the Roman multitudes.

Then came the fall. More or less hollow the shell may have been, must have been; none the less, it took several centuries to crush it and destroy it. Upon its ruins there grew no real nationalism for some fifteen centuries. The peoples of the north of Europe still lived the tribal life, banded together, to be sure, in some degree for safety and for war, and banded together with enough efficiency to overthrow imperial Rome herself. First, however, Christianity had undermined Rome's foundations and honeycombed her walls. The tribesmen of the north went back Christians; and the only tie approaching nationalism which may be said to have existed through the dark ages and the middle ages was that of a theocratic state, an ecclesiasticism centering at Rome and claiming all the tribes as its constituents. The Holy Father at Rome claimed sovereignty over all the world, and to a degree exercised it; but it was a sovereignty over divided and widely separated tribes, lacking in the real coherence of nationality. During the age of chivalry, the barons in their chateaus, castles, and strongholds, with their villagers and serfs grouped at the foot of their crags, exercised the sovereignty of little kings, chieftains of stronger or weaker bands of marauders.

Simultaneously with the Renaissance and the Reformation, came the dawn of nationalism in Europe,

whether these events were in relation of cause and effect or not. The city states had flourished in a measure—Venice, Florence, and the like; they had warred with each other; they had prospered and grown great by means of their commerce and naval expeditions; and a certain degree of domestic coherence had arisen among them. Perhaps they prepared the way for the Renaissance, for their expeditions to the Grecian peninsula had brought back the seeds which sprouted into the revival of learning and of the arts. But nothing approaching real nationalism had developed among them. Says Dr. S. Parkes Cadman in *Christianity and the State:* "The Renaissance, the Reformation, the various translations of the Bible, Luther's virile personality, and Calvin's formidable intellectualism, were the chief formative factors of modern nationalism. That of Scotland was derived from Geneva through John Knox; that of England came by the circuitous route of a characteristic independence, intensified by the isolation of the English people, and the resolution of the Plantagenet and Tudor monarchs to govern without outside interference."

I. GROWTH OF NATIONALISM IN EUROPE AND AMERICA

Origins of such ideas as nationalism are difficult to trace; sometimes they have their roots buried in the soil centuries ahead of the flower and fruit. Thus John Wyclif in England, sometimes called "The Morning Star of the Reformation," undoubtedly played the part of forerunner to the upheaval which took place on the continent and also to the slowly dawning sense of nation-

ality in his own country. An Oxford don, of great learning and courage, he insisted upon making the Bible an open book to the ploughboys of England as well as upon the fearless advocacy of those ideas of freedom and liberty which later Martin Luther put into such vigorous action. His earliest writings were in the nature of a defense of the British Parliament in refusing tribute to the Pope. Here he demonstrated his fellow feeling with the rise of nationalism and its interference with Roman authority. He declared independence for the individual worshiper without the mediation of the priest and anticipated the Protestant doctrine, which grew up two centuries later, of the infallibility of the Bible. He has by some been called the father of English prose.

The first nationality to lift its head plainly above the surrounding chaos was that developed by Swiss mountaineers. No doubt the rough and inaccessible character of their mountain homes begot the spirit of independence which rapidly cemented into their cantons. Love of their cliffs and peaks developed patriots in whom they took a just pride, like William Tell and Arnold Winklereid. The Reformation and John Calvin came along just at the right time. The keen and unbending steel of Calvin's character soon conquered the leadership among the Swiss and rapidly advanced the national consciousness which has continued unbroken through at least four centuries. Calvin prescribed laws and morals, statescraft as well as faith; and his influence is still felt in Switzerland, as it was long felt elsewhere, including the American colonies and the American republic.

Luther, of course, with his German Bible, did more

to unite divided German tribes and dukedoms than any other one individual in her history, not excluding Frederick the Great, Bismarck, and William I. Even the peasant revolt, the direct outgrowth of Luther's declaration of independence from Rome, a revolt which he deplored and did all he could to put down, only added in its ultimate effects to the sense of unity among the divided German tribes. From Luther forward, the development of German life and thought has marched steadily on to solidified nationality.

In England, Henry VIII, although dubbed "Defender of the Faith" by the Catholic church, rebelled ultimately against that church for the highly personal reason that he desired to marry six different wives, one after the other, and he couldn't do it without a breach with the Holy Father. From this time forward, he became a very different defender of the faith. Indeed, he led a Protestant revolt, followed by the utter independence of his stalwart and able daughter, Elizabeth. Under her powerful reign, England grew more and more Protestant, and more and more nationalistic. At the same time, John Knox, the Calvinistic preacher, was the real ruler of Scotland. From his pulpit in St. Giles he swayed the destiny of the kingdom in much the same way as Savonarola had done in Florence, and over a much longer period without a break.

France had her Joan of Arc, her Huguenots, her revolutions, and her Napoleon to weld the Gallic tribes steadily into a united whole. Although Joan was herself a devout Catholic, she was even more a devout patriot. She called herself, and people thought of her as, France

personified. She was the dawn, not only of nationhood in France and of burning patriotism, but also in a sense the dawn of the Reformation as well. At any rate, from her time forward, the sense of nationality grew among the French, and the Reformation followed hard upon her armies.

Geoffrey Parsons in *The Stream of History* makes the assertion that "the rise of nationalism in Europe furnished its extreme example in the division of the Scandinavian peoples, all closely akin, into the three independent nations of Norway, Denmark, and Sweden." They were separated during the middle ages, but united in 1397; and Sweden broke loose in 1523 and has continued separate to the present time. Norway, first under Danish control, swung later to Sweden in 1814 and regained final independence as late as 1907. Gustavus Adolphus, brilliant soldier king, raised Sweden to a high degree of power, which was developed under Charles XII early in the eighteenth century. Little Denmark at one time ruled the Baltic Sea, though she has never held great political or military power.

Across the seas came the Puritans and the Pilgrims, as well as the Cavaliers. Like the Spanish adventurers who preceded them, they still held allegiance to the sovereignties from which they came; but distance and maladministration gradually broke the ties; independence grew apace; and at the end of the Revolutionary War, the thirteen American colonies may be said to have been less like each other than they were like their respective mother countries. Nevertheless necessity drew them together and the long, slow process of forging out of them

a united nation began, a process which was not to end until the civil conflict closed in 1865. Although there were Roman Catholic settlers on American soil at the beginning, and although many immigrants of the same faith have come in during her history, still it is true that the prevailing faiths and philosophies which accompanied the birth of the republic were Protestant. So it is safe to say that nationalism in America and Protestantism, whether cause and effect or no, go hand in hand.

II. EXTREME NATIONALISM BREEDS WAR

Whether good for the world or bad for the world, there was no escape from the ultimate results of this intensified nationalism in a world conflict. Germany's consciousness of her nationality cannot be held responsible alone, in view of the knowledge which has come to us since the event, for the disastrous cataclysm. All round her were nationalisms as intensely self-conscious as hers. France burned like an incandescent light with national sentiment, with desire for revenge for Alsace-Lorraine, and with commercial ambition. Russia, writhing under the oppressions of her czars, was just preparing to burst into a new and independent nationhood. Belgium was colonizing; Italy aspired; England was dominating the waves of all the world, and brooking no rivalry in her rulership of the seas. Germany felt herself, whether rightly or wrongly, ringed about with a rim of steel. She only struck first, she thought, to keep from being struck. All these intense nationalisms were bound sooner or later to clash. There was no escape. What is more to

the purpose, unless the logic of Protestantism can work out something bigger and finer than mere nationalism, other clashes are bound to come. Another world war, such authorities as Admiral Lord Beatty and ex-Premier Lloyd George say, will mean the end of existing western civilization; and according to both authorities, nothing but the Christian religion at its best can prevent such a catastrophe.

It may be that this is the ultimate logic of Protestant nationalism, that it will destroy itself. It may be that providence, fate, whatever one cares to call it, may be setting the stage for such a decline and fall of western civilization. Empires and kingdoms and cultures have a way of rising, flourishing, and falling. It may be that another world conflict may arise out of the intense nationalism of today which will so weaken these white nationalities that the yellow, brown, and black races may flood in over their ruins to establish a new order, a new civilization, a totally different culture. Certainly some such end is likely, in the judgment of many cool and calm students, unless the rising tide of nationalism be checked and governed and possibly merged into a greater and a nobler thing.

III. CHRISTIAN INTERNATIONALISM THE ANTIDOTE

Enter, then, internationalism—a word with which to frighten conservatives in all lands, a bogey for "patriots" and one hundred per cent Englishmen, Americans, Germans, Italians, or French. The word "internationalism," however, cannot startle mankind any more than the word "reformation" startled them in Europe some

four hundred years ago. It may be called an impossible idealism, fraught with danger; it may be denounced by the press, by diplomats, by politicians, and by kings of industry, but denouncing will not keep it from being born. As a matter of fact, it is already born—a puny little infant to be sure, but born just the same, sucking lustily and gaining strength hour by hour. It is true that the preachments of Woodrow Wilson during and after the world conflict, the widest heard words of that epoch in human history, intensified greatly the self-consciousness and the nationalism of many little peoples. "Self-determination," his phrase, was on everybody's tongue. Many isolated groups sprang into nationhood almost over night; and the peace makers at Versailles put them on the map and marked out their boundaries plain and clear. In spite, however, of this occasional intensification of the nationalistic spirit, a new idea, or idealism, sprang from those same preachments, *viz.*, internationalism. One of the sixteen points upon which the world war armistice was signed and the peace negotiated was the formation of a League of Nations by which an international mind might take the place of the national mind. From this League of Nations, which in the event has proved to be a league of other nations than the United States, has grown a World Court by which it is hoped to supplant war with law.

It is not surprising that this new internationalism should be regarded as a foe by the old-fashioned patriots, nor that the old nationalism should be regarded as dangerous by internationally minded thinkers. So firmly rooted has this comparatively new-born nationalism

grown to be, in something like four centuries of time, that "patriotism" is now regarded, without definition, as one of the supreme virtues. The rank and file of most nations do not stop to distinguish between good and bad patriotism, wise and unwise patriotism, safe and dangerous patriotism. The patriotic spirit gone to seed may become nothing else but provincialism; and running amuck, nothing less than chauvinism or jingoism. "Lives there a man with soul so dead . . ." Of course, everybody loves the soil on which he was born, the scenes of his childhood, the highways and byways of long association. This fact ought, as the French say, to go without saying; it should be taken for granted. But the truest patriot does not wave the flag and shout, does not carry a chip on his shoulder, takes a just estimate and not an unfair one of his country's virtues and vices, and looks the facts squarely in the face. It is never any good not facing facts. It fools only one's self and one's countrymen to look at one's native land only through rose-colored glasses and at all other lands with jaundiced eyes. Such patriotism, falsely so-called, has been well named the last refuge of scoundrels. The ruthless politician and the conscienceless demagogue, as well as the unscrupulous militarist and profiteer, make their final appeal to this pseudo-patriotism. In the language of Edith Cavell, "Patriotism is not enough."

That this language is not overstrong for prevailing types of nationalism is made more than evident by Jonathan French Scott in his trenchant and startling little volume called *The Menace of Nationalism in Education.* He has searched the textbooks of France, Germany,

Great Britain, and the United States to show how children are misguided toward neighbor nations in their most impressionable years, and how distorted views of their own country, its victories and achievements, are bred into little minds so that they never can be rooted out. Most of us need only to recall our own school days to remember how we were drilled in hatred of the redcoats and the Hessians who took part against us in our Revolutionary War; how the defeats of 1812 in almost unbroken succession, including the capture and burning of Washington city, were turned into victories in our school text books; and how the battle of New Orleans, fought by Andy Jackson after that war was over, and with absolutely no effect upon the result, was exalted for us into a humiliation of the British empire. Perhaps very few Americans realize how the textbooks concerning our own civil conflict were written from so strictly a northern point of view—since the presses and publishing houses were all in the hands of the north and none in the hands of the impoverished south—that they could not be used in southern schools where the people knew that the facts had been distorted. Southern sensibilities were outraged by the use of such words as "rebels," when the Confederates did not consider themselves rebels, and were not rebels. Southern teachers, in turn, practically without textbooks, just turned the thing around and exalted Lee, Jackson, Beauregard, and the rest, into demigods. This illustration, unimportant though it may be in influencing international attitudes, only brings home to American readers the dangerous and egregious partisanship of writings that might be so much

more disastrous, such as German textbooks exalting the fatherland and denouncing France and England, or French textbooks kindling the desire for revenge in French hearts against her nearest neighbor to the north and east. The whole vicious system of provincial patriotism gone to seed, patriotism running amuck in the schools, in the public press, and on the platform, it is easy to see, can do irreparable damage and render wars inevitable.

IV. PATRIOTISM GONE TO SEED

Such false patriotism would teach every nation that all its acts are rooted and grounded in justice, right, and unselfishness, all its wars waged in self-defense and never in aggression, and all its motives beyond all criticism or suspicion of self-seeking. Who that has listened to political speakers in the United States, the Fourth of July and Thanksgiving Day orators, including ministers of the gospel, has not heard the repeated assertion that "America never fought except in self defense"; when any student who has had access to unbiased works of history knows perfectly well that we have fought wars of aggression and have annexed territory at the mouth of the cannon. Our citizens have promoted revolution, as for example in Hawaii, preparatory to annexation. And, as for the Isthmus of Panama, President Theodore Roosevelt frankly said, "I reached out and took it." Furthermore, the world is beginning to learn that there is a type of peaceful penetration, with industry, transportation, and finance, that is no less real and no less

powerful than that with military arms. Neither America, nor any other nation, dare honestly make the claim that it has never fought except in self defense, and never been actuated by selfish motives. Such a claim is falsehood and nothing else. Many unbiased students of history declare that when any nation sees that something is to be got by war, that nation will fight. To such a degree has nationalism developed. Unchecked and unleashed, it threatens the world.

Who, then, is to check it? If Protestantism may be credited or charged with giving birth to nationalism, and if Protestantism holds the religious leadership of what we call the civilized world, then it would seem that Protestantism must do the job, if anybody can. This huge and menacing child of Protestantism, intense nationalism, may grow too big, powerful, and ungovernable for its parent to handle. Certainly all the resources of the Protestant spirit must be taxed to the utmost in its discipline. To the present moment, that spirit seems to have sidestepped the responsibility. Protestantism apparently is not thinking in international terms; it is thinking in denominational, national, and even parochial terms. For the huge task of internationalism, men have got to think in world terms. If the religion of Jesus means anything at all, it means that the Samaritan is our neighbor and brother; and today the Samaritan means, to us Americans, the German, the English, the French, the Japanese. Somehow, in our minds, if we carry out the logic of Protestantism, we must draw these distant neighbors up close to us with television photog-

raphy and see them face to face and understand them heart to heart.

V. CO-OPERATION NECESSARY TO SAVE THE WORLD

How can this be accomplished except by participation in every type of conference and commission, economic or political, hygienic or industrial? It is the part of Protestant peoples particularly, if charged with the leadership of the world, to say to one another and to all, "Come let us reason together." It is the part of each one to engage in every world court, every world conference, every world association, every peace pact, every disarmament conference, looking towards that far-off ideal of fraternal democracies ultimately growing into a united states of the world. Edmund Burke once said, "You cannot indict a whole nation." Perhaps, then, it may be said, "You cannot indict a whole religion." If, however, Protestantism fails of her obligation and her opportunity to think in world terms and to act with world measures, the next world war will indict her anyhow.

During the last world conflict we were assured that it was a war to end wars, that it was to make the world safe for democracy, that it was to usher in a period of international thinking and living. We are yet too near to the event to know whether these high ideals shall arise out of the smoke and the ruins and the untimely death of some thirteen millions of young men or not. But this much we do know, that the idealism of those strenuous years, receding like the swinging of a pendulum—as all such moments of high heroism must recede

—into the doldrums of disillusionment and fatigue, must be renewed again and take the ascendant. Otherwise, the struggles and the blood of that convulsion must go for naught. Those fifty thousand boys who wore the American khaki and who lie in Flanders fields, will have died in vain. We just went over there and got mixed up in a European commercial and nationalistic quarrel and won the victory for one side and not for the other, and didn't do any good on earth, unless out of that terrible conflict there comes some attempt, at least, at a moral substitute for the belated barbarism of war. Unless our Protestantism begins to think internationally and act internationally, the blood of those boys will cry out to us from the ground, and we shall hear them saying:

> "To you from failing hands we throw the torch,
> Be yours to hold it high.
> If ye break faith with us who die,
> We shall not sleep though poppies grow in Flanders fields."

In *The History of American Idealism,* by Gustavus Myers, is the following illuminating paragraph: "Has history any surprises? We all have endlessly heard the formula that 'history repeats itself.' In one great respect America may fairly claim to have thrown that ancient aphorism to the winds. There have been in the annals of history occasional appearances of great religious, moral and idealistic leaders. But where in all history is to be found the precedent of a people idealistic and to such a preponderant degree that the nominal leaders

simply expressed what the people themselves felt and thought? As an idealistic nation America has proved that, after all, history is still in an incipient stage. The American people have provided the surprise of ages in writing an unprecedented species of history and they will write more. The most lavish dreamer cannot vision the future possibilities embedded in this invincible idealism."

CHAPTER XV

Re-discovery of Jesus and the Kingdom of God

WHATEVER sins may be laid at the door of Protestantism, and they are many—of omission and commission—this much must be said in its behalf, that it has rediscovered and re-presented the historic personality of Jesus, the man and teacher, in such a way as has never been done hitherto in eighteen or nineteen centuries. The greater the character in history, the more the tendency for myth and legend to gather round it until it becomes dim, misty, shadowy in its very exaltation. A distorted picture grows so easily and so rapidly in the minds and imaginations of men that but a short time needs to elapse until such characters become quite different from their realities. If this is true of King David, heroes of Homer, Charlemagne, Henry of Navarre, George Washington, Bonaparte, and Lenin, how much more likely is it that it should be true of Jesus of Nazareth, concerning whom so little was written and since whose day so many centuries have rolled over the heads of humanity.

During all the long annals of the church, the person of Jesus was submerged beneath the figure of his mother, the Virgin Mary. Saints and apostles and prophets crowded him into a corner of the stage. Doctrines and creeds and intricate theological systems enshrouded him,

until these became more and more, while he grew less and less. It remained for the scholars of Protestantism to strip away the mists of antiquity, to push aside the crowding figures that stood between him and the eyes of men, to tear down the massive structures of creed and symbol and system, and to let him loose in all the charm of his reality for the eyes of men to behold. The story of this rediscovery of Jesus, told by Albert Schweitzer in *The Quest of the Historical Jesus,* reads like a tremendous epic and dramatic *Odyssey,* thrills and stirs the reader. No wonder the education of any young theological student of today is considered incomplete without a knowledge of this romantic story so vividly told by that Swiss musician, philosopher, theologian, and good physician who has buried himself in the heart of Africa to serve his fellows as Jesus served his.

I. JESUS REDISCOVERED AFTER TWO THOUSAND YEARS

This story is laid largely in the nineteenth century. During that period in which science, principally Protestant-born, was growing up to mature and stalwart stature, not the least of the objects of research to which the newly awakened minds of men devoted themselves, but probably the greatest single topic of investigation, is the man Jesus. Beginning with Strauss in Germany, whose *Leben Jesu* was the pioneer of the lives of Christ and still a work monumental and beautiful in character; and continuing with Ernest Renan and his *Vie de Jesu* in France, a highly imaginary but none the less artistic and literary study of this character, the lives of Jesus have

come pouring from the press in a steady and increasing stream. At this moment no reader can keep up with the flood of them that an insatiable public seems to demand. For a hundred years now the best brains of the western world have devoted themselves as tirelessly and as avidly to the pursuit of the truth about Jesus as they have to the discovery of poison gases or the perfection of aviation and the radio. Yes, it is safe to say that even more scholarship, genius, and indefatigable effort have been directed toward this end than even the natural sciences have commanded. Men have toiled night and day in the libraries, deciphering old manuscripts, restoring faded and double-written ones, have traveled at great pains and even personal danger to the monasteries of the Fayoum and Asia Minor, have threaded the footsteps of Paul in his great journeys, have excavated in the Holy Land, and have followed the trail of Jesus almost with foot rule and microscope to find the exact truth about him.

The result stands out plain and clear for even those who are not scholars today to inherit. The biggest part of the New Testament has been set aside as teaching us little about the real Jesus, and sometimes little about his thought. The sources of the historical picture of the Christ have been reduced principally to the first three gospels; and even these must be dissected carefully and scientifically to get at the contemporary story. The fourth gospel, John, so long a favorite with Christian worshipers, and even today deservedly popular with them, we now know to be more a Greek gospel, filled with the philosophy and the atmosphere of the ancient

Greek world, than a Palestinian document reflecting the first thirty years of the first century. Jesus had scarcely been laid in the new-made tomb until the legends began to grow around him, just as they have grown around Lenin of Russia, dead only some six years. There were no written documents for many years after Jesus' death, and the prolific word of mouth, handed on from one to another, rolled up like a snowball of accretion and extraneous matter. A well-nigh superhuman task has been that of the Protestant scholars of the last century, coolly and ruthlessly to tear away, dig away, hew away all this accretion, hardened by the ages, and to release from the marble block of eighteen centuries of tradition the snow-white Christ embedded there. This they have done until the work is practically complete and one may venture the assertion that the real Jesus of the first thirty-three years of the Christian era is better known today than he was in the year 50 of the first Christian century.

II. THE TEACHING OF JESUS UNEARTHED

It follows, of course, that what Jesus really taught, which is the essential thing for us, has likewise by Protestant scholarship been dug up out of the masses of non-essential matter that have been heaped upon his message through ignorant and superstitious centuries. Not creeds and catechisms, not rubrics and litanies, not the findings of councils and theologians, but the Simon-pure utterance and emphasis of Jesus have come forth as from the tomb in a veritable resurrection and in a light often blinding to the eyes of men. It is easy to forget that for less than a century, due to the inexorable inves-

tigations of Protestant scientific men, we have known that the sum of the teaching of Jesus is found in the phrase "the kingdom of God." That phrase has lived, to be sure, throughout all the subsequent centuries, even as it existed many centuries before Jesus was born; but it was not until the nineteenth that this idea was driven into the minds of men like a nail and clinched on the other side, never to be shaken out. The hold upon the idea had ever been loose and half-hearted; now let us hope we are gripping it with some degree of relentlessness and finality.

To the Jewish mind that phrase meant the triumph of their people and their tribal or national god. It meant the undisputed reign of Jahweh over the other nations of the earth, with the clouds and smoke of a theocratic empire circling round the temple at Jerusalem. It meant the destruction of the Roman yoke, the downfall of Greek influence, the dissipation of Egyptian and Assyrian power, and the supremacy of Israel, with all the trees bowing down to the king who should come and set up this rule and all the roads of the world leading to his throne and his sanctuary. Men have dreamed of utopias in all times, from Plato and his ideal republic, through Augustine and his city of God, Savonarola and his, Calvin and his, Sir Thomas More and his utopia, clear down to H. G. Wells and the Russian communists. Jesus dreamed, but in a different way from any and all of these, of his "kingdom of God," his celestial city, his rule of God in the hearts and not in the eyes of men. His dream was a totally different dream, only slowly beginning to penetrate the minds of modern men, sharpened

in its cutting edge by the scholarship, mostly Protestant, of the scientific age.

III. THE KINGDOM OF GOD NOT VISIBLE

The key to his idea of his utopia is in the little clause, "the kingdom of God cometh not with observation," a negative utterance that cuts away all the traditional Jewish materialism that had preceded him and equally lops off all the Christian materialism that has followed him. His idea, perhaps best phrased by Josiah Royce, is that of a "beloved community," a fraternity of all mankind, a comradeship, a friendship, a community of interest and service. Of course, it cannot be seen, as it resides within the hearts of men, consists of spiritual qualities and forces—gentleness, kindness, helpfulness, love. The success of this ideal city of God cannot be measured by the size of buildings or treasuries, by numbers of converts or communicants. It cannot be measured at all. It has no boundary line; or, rather, it has only waving and jagged boundaries which cut out many that we think are in and cut in many that we think are out. You cannot say concerning the kingdom of God, "Lo, here it is," or "Lo, there it goes," for "it is among you, even within you." Jesus believes and teaches that those qualities which characterize family relationships are the qualities of this kingdom of God. In families, the ideal is to give and take, to live and let live, to love and serve, you first and me last; in short, unselfish love. That, believes Jesus, is the ideal for all social relationships, world wide, with those who live close to us and those who live on the other side of the

world. This and nothing less is the rarefied atmosphere of his idealism in that phrase most often heard from his lips, "the kingdom of God."

The ideal has a double significance: first, for the inner life of each one; and, second, for the social relationships of all. This reign of God, or reign of love, must transform the character of every human being who attempts to walk in the footsteps of Jesus. Perhaps this is what the Quakers mean by "the inner light.' The kingdom of God within a man shines out in face and action with an inward incandescence. His bearing is one of sympathy, understanding, kindness, and service; he is a comrade to everybody else. He cannot be the self-seeking opponent, the adversary, let alone the ruthless exploiter of any living human being. The attitude of the ideal father and mother towards children, the ideal brother or sister towards each other or towards parents, marks the individual who has entered into the kingdom of God. The historical Jesus himself best displays the characteristics which he taught.

Then the social bearing of this idealism comes looming up plainly in our scientific age. We can no longer strain at gnats and swallow camels when once we adopt the kingdom of God as our ideal in human contacts. We can no longer lay double emphasis upon the peccadillos of people and blind our eyes to the glaring social sins which are all round us. Professor Edward A. Ross, of the University of Wisconsin, in *Sin and Society,* written in the spirit of a scientific era by a scientific man, seeks to give us this rational view of a new doctrine of sin. In his preface he says:

"In its reactions against wrong-doing the public is childishly naïve and sentimental. It is content with the surface look of things. It lays emphasis where emphasis was laid centuries ago. . . . It never occurs to the public that sin evolves along with society, and that the perspective in which it is necessary to view misconduct changes from age to age. Hence, in today's warfare on sin, the reactions of the public are about as serviceable as gongs and stinkpots in a modern battle. Rationalize public opinion; modernize it and bring it abreast of latter-day sin; make the blame of the many into a flaming sword guarding the sacred interests of society."

Professor Ross then has much to say about sin and syndicates, about the over-emphasis on the comparatively unimportant sins which hurt principally one's self, and the lack of emphasis upon the wholesale sins that hurt thousands of others. Here is a paragraph that is like an earthquake, and that voices the so-called social gospel, a legitimate child of Protestantism in the twentieth century:

"People are sentimental, and bastinado wrong-doing not according to its harmfulness, but according to the infamy that has come to attach to it. Undiscerning, they chastise with scorpions the old authentic sins, but spare the new. They do not see that boodling is treason, that blackmail is piracy, that embezzlement is theft, that speculation is gambling, that tax-dodging is larceny, that railroad discrimination is treachery, that the factory labor of its children is slavery, that deleterious adulteration is murder. It has not come home to them that the fraudulent promoter 'devours widows' houses,' that the

monopolist 'grinds the faces of the poor,' that mercenary editors and spellbinders 'put bitter for sweet and sweet for bitter.' The cloven hoof hides in patent leather; and today, as in Hosea's time, the people 'are destroyed for lack of knowledge.' The mob lynches the red-handed slayer, when it ought to keep a gallows Haman-high for the venal mine inspector, the seller of infected milk, the maintainer of a fire-trap theater. The child-beater is forever blasted in reputation, but the exploiter of infant toil or the concocter of a soothing syrup for the drugging of babies stands a pillar of society. The petty shoplifter is more abhorred than the stealer of a franchise, and the wife-whipper is outcast long before the man who sends his over-insured ship to founder with its crew."

IV. THE SOCIAL GOSPEL AN UNREALIZED IDEAL

No one of us but knows men whose business ethics differ as widely as the poles from their family ethics or church ethics. We all know men and concerns whose reputation for shady and ruthless dealings is known all over their territory and yet who, as individuals, are honored in their communities and in their churches. They do not hesitate during the week to over-reach, to misrepresent, to exploit, and to cheat; while on Sunday they sit in the sanctuary in front pews, meet with committees and boards, devise plans for what they call the "kingdom of God" and give large sums for benevolent purposes. Strange the intellectual feat they perform of keeping their religion in one air-tight and water-tight compartment and their business in another one. This

fact is well known in American life but none the less needs ten times the emphasis that has yet been given to it. Protestant preachers would do well to cease wasting their time in attacks on bridge-players, dancers, or petters, and put in their time assailing men who steal and murder on a tremendous scale. The conscience money that is poured out in founding universities and building great institutions, in charities and benevolences, in the United States, has never been equaled in the world's history; and too often it is just as truly blood money as the thirty pieces of silver that Judas took and then in his disgust and despair threw down at the feet of his ruthless employers.

Men whose souls are eaten up by the guilt of these colossal crimes can have no sort of comprehension of the true kingdom of God within the heart, with its peace and serenity, with its appreciation of all beauty in Nature and in human life. Of such men, the Protestant poet, Wordsworth, in the nineteenth century exclaimed:

> "Great God! I'd rather be a pagan
> Suckled in a creed outworn;
> So might I, standing on this pleasant lea,
> Have glimpses that would make me less forlorn;
> Have sight of Proteus rising from the sea,
> Or hear old Triton blow his wreathed horn."

It goes without saying that Protestantism cannot claim exclusive origination for the social gospel; but it is not too much to claim that for the most part it has borne the burden of this emphasis in the last twenty or thirty years. Walter Rauschenbusch, with his *Christianity and the Social Crisis,* now a little over a score

of years old, gained the reputation of being the foremost interpreter in his time of social Christianity, and the prophet of a new reformation. It is the Protestant churches which have brought about and are still bringing about the most striking social reforms of the present day. The leaders of the Labor movement and Labor party in England belong mostly to non-conformist churches; very few of them are in the established church of England. The members of the Labor government are mostly identified with these free Protestant churches. The first lord of the admiralty is a lay preacher in the Baptist church, and several others in high positions are lay preachers. In America, it was the Federal Council of Churches which brought about the reduction of the twelve-hour day in the steel industry to the eight-hour day, an achievement which called for heroism, for sacrifice financial and otherwise, on the part of the daring men who pushed it through. Labor ought never to forget that. Perhaps it is safe to say that Protestant churches proclaiming the social gospel have done more for labor than labor unions themselves have done. Protestantism has been unrelenting in its fight against child labor and its advocacy of maternity legislation and insurance. In making this assertion, one need not forget the devoted efforts of Catholic and Jewish welfare associations; but one must weigh fairly the stress placed upon these matters from one source or another and the comparative success attending the efforts.

Whatever may be said about the causes which brought about the passage of the eighteenth amendment to the American constitution, however much it may be con-

ceded that big business, in the interests of mass production, finally pushed this amendment through, nevertheless it must be agreed that it was the Protestant voice, pre-eminently in the Methodist, Baptist, and Disciples churches, which first lifted the insistent cry against legalized liquor. Whatever may be the varying opinions concerning the social value of this experiment, it is clear, none the less, that Protestant churches are responsible largely for its inception.

V. INTERRACIAL RELATIONS

Under the head of the social reform message derivable from the idea of the kingdom of God, must be placed the promotion of better interracial conditions in modern life. Wherever there are any attempts at better understanding on the part of different races, Protestants are playing the leading rôle in the promotion of them. The effort to put into practice the Golden Rule in the dealings of whites with blacks and blacks with whites in American life seems to be fostered principally by Protestant leaders in the field of social science and social ethics. The voices that are raised on the platform and in the public prints with any degree of insistency upon this topic seem to be pre-eminently Protestant voices. The churches that are exchanging preachers between the races, and those which observe race relations Sundays now and again, are Protestant churches. The officers and leaders of race relations commissions are the officers and leaders in church federations and in the Federal Council of Churches. Those educational institutions which make a point of fair play between these two races in America

are mostly institutions dominated by the Protestant spirit. Here, if anywhere, the kingdom of God, the comradeship of men, the beloved community, however you prefer to phrase Jesus' central idea, is the dominating theme.

Other quarters of the earth besides America struggle against the difficulties of race relations, such as various lands in the Far East, India, China, and the international territories in the eastern hemisphere. Here race feeling is just as hot and keen as it has ever been on the American continent. In Cape Colony, and South Africa in general, the contact of race with race engenders prejudice and heat and passion. Here the voice of the Nazarene, as released by Protestant scholarship in the last century, rings out against the oppression of man by his fellow-man, against the inhumanity of man to man bringing mourning to countless thousands, and counseling kindness and brotherhood, mutual toleration and service. There is a long, long way to go to the realization of the ideals of Jesus in race relations; but at least some few faltering steps have been taken along that road.

VI. WAR AND PEACE

In the direction of world peace perhaps more has been done in the last eleven years, the period succeeding the world war, than in any century in human history. These measures for peace on earth among men of good will are in directest harmony with the master conception of the kingdom of God, the reign of heaven in the hearts of men and in all the earth. Catholic, Protestant, and even pagan lands have all been caught up into this

longing for peace. It is hoped and believed by such leaders as Sir Gilbert Murray that even the Moslem countries will soon be drawn into the League of Nations. That institution is the rainbow of hope for Europe and most of the rest of the world, the only hope they see upon their horizon. The World Court, to which almost all the nations have now adhered, to the extent even of signing the optional clause of the protocol, agreeing to submit all their differences to compulsory arbitration and adjudication—the World Court, the child of the League, is nothing less than an arch of protection over the heads of otherwise defenseless nations. The Kellogg anti-war pact, a good resolution, none the less weighty for being simply a resolution, has a moral value incalculable in banishing the spirit of fear and hostility from the minds of men. Never perhaps in history has the world been so passionately desirous of peace as it is just now. All but universal is this longing and yearning for the paths of peace. And who can say how much of this profound desire comes from an increasing comprehension of this dynamic ideal of Jesus, the kingdom of God, dug up out of the obscurity of centuries by Protestant scholarship and scattered to the ends of the earth so that such men as Gandhi and Tagore are teaching it in India; and generals in China, perhaps as truly Christian as some captains of industry in America, call it their life creed. And who is to say how much even Russia in her communism, her straining after what some consider to be an impossible ideal of comradeship and community service, may be beholden to the Nazarene whom avowedly they reject? No gas or ether or atmosphere can pene-

trate more pervasively than a great idea; and this idea of the kingdom of God has not only begun to penetrate but has already penetrated remote continents, and is rapidly forcing its way into the nooks and crannies of places far from Europe and from the seats of Protestant scholarship. It comes not with observation; it cannot be seen; but its effects are manifest to those who have scanned the conditions of the world.

This, then, is the thesis of this chapter, that Protestantism through its devoted scholarship, which regardless of consequences has bored deeply under the strata of eighteen centuries of dust for the truth about Jesus, has rediscovered him, unearthed him, placed him fairly before the eyes of men, has outlined the indubitable historical facts about his personality, shown his strength and his loveliness to the astonished eyes of men, so that the imaginations of people everywhere are quickened and charmed by him. Then, in searching for the essence of his teaching, these same scholars have determined that his supreme idea and utterance is his beautiful dream of a kingdom of God among men, a beloved community, a world-wide comradeship in which the ethics that characterize family life at its best shall apply to all human relationships without limitation or discrimination. As a corollary to this world-shaking and world-moving ideal, there comes into human thought and upon human lips the piercing message of a gospel which has to do with business, to make it mutually helpful and never mutually destructive; into industrial concerns, to lay the emphasis upon humane dealings of managers with men and men with managers, upon devotion to the interest

of stockholder by handworker and of handworker by stockholder, nothing less. There follows in the logic of this gospel the inevitable conclusion that a man is a man for a' that, no matter what the texture or the pigment of his skin, the contour of his skull, or the character of the hair which surmounts it. To this ideal of the beloved community the thought of war and its belated barbarism, abhorrent and irreconcilable, organized murder and destruction of life and property, becomes impossible of entertainment even for one single moment of temporary insanity. All this stream of thought and spur to action, Protestantism, if it has not originated, has at least helped forward into the life of this world.

CHAPTER XVI

The Outlook for Protestantism

PRESIDENT ELIOT of Harvard used to say that the greatest satisfaction in this world lay in giving one's life to the service of an institution which one knew would endure long after his service is done. Now some of us have wondered much whether the Protestant church at large is gaining or waning, is headed for a splendid future or for a gradual good-night. Some of the best brains of the world are seriously concerned with that elemental question. Many able observers in both hemispheres declare that Protestantism is waning, is decadent, has entered upon its eclipse, is headed for final extinction. Difficult as it is to gather evidences for or against this prediction, much as figures compiled largely by Protestants may mislead us, we may none the less find many more or less intangible evidences supporting this view.

For example, Dean Inge has recently said that the golden age of preaching is past. He speaks for England, to be sure; but what happens in England sooner or later is likely to happen in America. The golden age of preaching no doubt recedes into the past in this country as well as in the mother land. The names of commanding preachers in America may be counted on the fingers of one hand. Country people who would listen eagerly for an hour or two hours to a preacher have given place

to city people who will not listen with patience for twenty to thirty minutes. It is impossible in the cities to gather evening audiences even for the most powerful men. The "foolishness of preaching" no longer gathers a gaping crowd on Sunday nights. City ways and city manners, with all the complexity and diversions and distractions of city life, demand a different type of assemblage, if any; so Sunday evening clubs, forums, and motion pictures have supplanted the old-time evening service. Where preaching is still continued at the evening hour, a mere handful, except in very unusual instances, listen to it. Morning services still attract, though to a much more limited degree than even a generation ago; and how many of those who come are moved simply by the force of habit, remains an open question. In the average Protestant congregation, where are the young who have formed no such life-time habit of church attendance?

It may be argued that the preachers are to blame for bringing a deadly dull message instead of a thrilling and throbbing one, and no doubt the accusation is fair and just. It may be also argued that the laity share the blame because they do not promote their churches as they promote so many other phases of their business, intellectual, and social life. Quite possibly the whole church organization may be blamed for hanging on to rural and countrified ways of doing things in a distinctly urban age. Whatever the specific criticism of the methods adopted by the church, they all resolve themselves finally into an indictment of the spirit of Protestantism.

Another evidence pointing to the decline and fall of

Protestantism lies in the division and disharmony so apparent to the most casual observer. In an age when the whole tendency is toward amalgamation, the drawing together of units into a central whole, an age of trusts and chains in all departments of life and in all nations, the church has flung apart into literally hundreds of divided and dissevered fragments. The man in the street sees these futile divisions, the unbusiness-like character of church conduct, and turns silently away from it, saying to himself, it may be half unconsciously, "I will have nothing to do with such maladministration."

One may almost see in England the loosening hold of the established church upon the masses and the weakening grip even of the non-conformist churches. At the universities of Oxford and Cambridge almost none of the graduates are preparing for the ministry. Recently I counted the names of thirteen men registered as students at Manchester New College, Oxford, presided over by that radiant prophet, Principal L. P. Jacks. In Germany Protestantism fights for its very life. The Dom in Berlin, the Kaiser's old church, still is crowded to the doors; but its atmosphere, royalist in character, jangles the nerves of every citizen devoted to the German republic; the old church of Luther hangs on to a past and fallen régime. Throughout Germany Protestant churches draw but a handful. In France, of course, Protestantism has never taken hold and presents no more encouraging features today than it ever did. Even in Calvinist Switzerland, internationalism seems almost to have supplanted Protestantism as a religion of the people. In

America a diminishing number of college men are fitting themselves as clergymen. If you ask an audience of high school students how many intend to be farmers, they will laugh; if you ask how many intend to be ministers, they will guffaw. Whatever the statistics of church additions may show on paper, the cool observer is bound to question whether city people in large numbers are accepting church membership.

Another evidence of the decadence of Protestantism lies in the fact that it has almost no hold upon hand-workers. The church as at present administered is middle-class, bourgeois, and makes little appeal to the masses of working men and working women. Time was when the workers on the farms and in the little shops constituted the backbone of the Protestant church; today they are seldom to be found within its walls; little if anything is done to make them feel they belong there; the atmosphere of the place seems not to be created for the hand-worker. There are notable exceptions, but these only prove the rule; taken by and large, Protestantism no longer reaches out for any but the white-collared middle-class.

I. CAUSES OF A SUNSET FOR PROTESTANTISM?

So much for a rough statement of the evidences for a waning Protestantism. What are the reasons for this loosening hold upon the twentieth century? Some of these have already been hinted at in the statement of the evidence for decline. There is the failure on the part of the church to adapt itself to an utterly changed civilization. While business all about us grasps new situations

and new customs and makes radical changes to meet them, the church goes on following the same old methods of a day that is dead and gone. The passenger agent of a great railway, reminded that the automobile had just about destroyed short-haul passenger traffic, only smiled and said, "Oh, well, let it go; we'll do something else." Then a few weeks later came the announcement that a great transcontinental system had introduced a bus line to parallel its railway and to take care of the short-haul traffic. Another line introduces the airplane for daytime travel and the sleeping car at night for those desiring to cross the continent. The church meanwhile holds on to the spring wagon and a team of horses, and even the ox-cart, and goes rumbling along in a rut.

If a minister or a church leader wants to do something in a different way from the old village method in which it has always been done, he would better not take it up with his board, for he will be met with instantaneous opposition. Conservatism will rear back in the harness and push on the breech-strap while he tries vainly to go ahead. After long experience, I have found out, have been told by older ministers, and have advised younger men in turn, that if they wish to do new and up-to-date and citified things, they would better begin with men outside their churches, or they would better go ahead and do what they intend to do and consult their church members afterwards. Most city churches in America at this good hour consist of unreconstructed country-jakes.

One other reason for the slipping hold of Protestant-

ism lies in its dishonesty, its absolute untruthfulness, its deep-dyed insincerity. It still claims to believe, and even believes it believes, a whole lot of out-grown doctrine which it has long since thrown away. Preachers, afraid of their own people, overawed by the supposed conservatism of their influential contributors, do not hesitate to declare over and over positions which they know to be false. It seems cruel to blame these preachers, because they have wives and children dependent upon them, and the loss of their places may mean loss of bread and butter for their families; and yet the heroic spirit, the daring spirit, the spirit of martyrdom, to a degree at least, seldom fails to win its way to recognition and support.

Not the least burden of obloquy, however, for this essential dishonesty of too much of the Protestant church rests upon the shoulders of laymen. Most of them do not read, do not think, and yet presume to assert their intellectual opinions and prejudices blatantly and to brow-beat their ministers into cowardly subjection. A great many "men who knew Coolidge" sit in the pews as in the smoking compartments of Pullman cars, with their minds made up on all questions sublunary and celestial, set like cement, unchangeable, dogmatic, domineering. No wonder they frighten the average minister until he shakes in his shoes. A dishonest church and a cowardly minister can never lay hold upon a stalwart generation of men and women. Unless the church speaks out with honesty and sincerity repudiating the out-grown and out-worn and asserting unequivocally

its honest convictions it cannot hope to hold its own in a changing time.

Moreover, the ancient ruts of expression and phraseology in which the old ox-cart goes jogging along cannot but alienate the young people and the man of the world. The Protestant church persists in employing in prayer, in public utterance, and in ritualistic observance, ancient words and phrases which not only mean nothing but are actually false. Thus the preacher talks about the "rum-traffic" when there has been very little rum utilized since the days of the Spanish Main. That is bound to rub a newspaper man or an up-to-date business man the wrong way. The preacher talks about getting religion when we no longer consider that religion is a commodity to be got; about salvation when the world does not any longer believe that it is condemned; about the scheme of redemption when the word scheme makes all of us mad. It is the easiest thing in the world for the professional religious teacher to hang on to the old phrases of ancient Christianity long since gone into the colloquial discard, or even of a Judaism out of date some three thousand years; and it requires constant watchfulness on the part of such a teacher or preacher to fight shy of the old inheritance handed down to him in these cant words and phrases.

This inherited vocabulary forms part of the deadly boredom of the average Protestant church service, its sleepiness and its unreality as well as its insincerity. No wonder the average high school student or young collegian or even thoughtful and reading business man not only remains uninterested in this unctuous flow of

phrases but finds himself actually offended and left cold. A living church must use living language, as nearly as may be the words and phrases, the taste and tang, of shops and offices, of the street and the home; refined, of course, with all the culture the church can command, all the artistry and the literary finish it can obtain, but none the less close to the realities of life, even down to the grass roots of human nature and human interest. The unforgivable crime of Protestant churches is the dullness which grows out of cant, dishonesty, cowardice. Here again the ministers err, but the laymen err with them. The responsibility rests upon both of them for failure to make their churches live, pulsate with life, and grow.

Unbusinesslike methods in the administration of church machinery helps on the downfall of Protestantism. For the most part no layman would conduct his business in the slipshod fashion in which, at odd moments, he conducts his church's business. He would not even allow his favorite club to fall into the extravagances, the deficits, and the rattling, jarring makeshifts to which without any compunction of conscience he subjects his church. The administration of church affairs too often, indeed almost always, falls upon the shoulders of overburdened ministers. People say that preachers have little business sense; just the contrary is true, for if they were not generally able executives, the old one-hoss shay would utterly collapse and go to pieces. Indeed, the modern city minister, more's the pity, is more executive than anything else, more business man than student, more money-getter than prophet. Here the laity are ex-

clusively to blame. If they felt their responsibility as members and leaders in their churches, they would lift the load of business administration entirely off the shoulders of their ministers and leave them free to give themselves exclusively to their priestly and prophetic calling. Perhaps this state of affairs is just as much evidence as it is cause of the decline of Protestantism; perhaps it is both. Many men who from the outside view this chaotic and inefficient business management no doubt withhold their countenance and support from anything so foreign to their own business customs.

II. DISHARMONY AND DISUNION BRING DECAY

The dissension within the Protestant church likewise makes for its declining hold upon the masses of people. The very individualism which in this volume has been pointed out as a virtue of the Protestant movement may run so far, and does run so far, as to jeopardize the safety and the future of the movement itself. The fightings within create fears without. The battles over insignificant matters, tweedledum and tweedledee, so-called fundamentals that really are non-essentials, and the attempt on the part of one mind to dominate another mind, to make it think in a certain set way, so violates everything that we have learned of recent years about the very constitution of the human mind, that the futility of such an attempt grows increasingly evident to the ordinary man even though he may know nothing about the science of psychology. Somehow this scientific knowledge has seeped down into the masses of the people and they resent the absurdity of an attempt at domina-

tion over their own minds or those of others. When, therefore, they see Don Quixotes in the pulpit tilting at impossible windmills, slavishly followed by their Sancho Panzas, preachers and laymen alike fighting battles against imaginary foes, the utter ridiculousness of the whole procedure bowls them over and they refuse to come back and be bowled over again. They comprehend the nonsense of the procedure, the waste of valuable time and opportunity. The hearts of men are sick with longing. with disappointment, with sorrow and perplexity, with pent up and unexpressed comradeship and love. They have pulling and hauling enough all during the week in their factories and offices and stores; they don't want any more pulling and hauling in their religious services. They want relief and release from strife, they want peace, they want courage and some satisfaction for mute and nameless aspirations. Until the church lays off controversy and lays on with comradeship, it may expect to continue its slipping hold upon men of the world.

III. EMPHASIS WHERE EMPHASIS IS DUE

Not only does the church blaze away, in futile and intolerant fashion, at supposed theological errors, but often it fails to recognize changing moral attitudes as well. It hangs on to ten commandments formulated some three thousand years ago by Jewish thinkers scarcely out of the nomadic stage and scarcely settled in the agricultural, as if they were still laws of the Medes and Persians for an industrial civilization such as ours. They forget that Jesus upset the whole Jewish régime,

laws, commandments, scriptures, and all. They forget furthermore that Jesus upset the whole legalistic attitude towards ethics for all time. They refuse to believe in him and to take him at his face value. They continue to tithe, mint, anise and cummin, to use his own phrase, and to neglect his spirit. The church today fails to assail economic crime and sin and continues with sledge-hammer blows to assault the sins of the flesh, the so-called more generous sins, toward which Jesus was, to say the least, extremely lenient. Almost any pulpit in any Protestant church thunders more today against intemperance, against sexual excess or aberration, against dancing, card-playing, and the theater; while it is utterly silent against avarice and greed, envy, jealousy, malice, hatred, the hard, cold bitter sins that destroy human life.

Sensual excess may well be called generous sin, for it is throwing life away, giving life for social or other reasons, spending it like a spendthrift; but after all, it is worth remembering that Jesus prized generosity so highly that he could say that whoever saves his life loses it, and whoever loses it saves it. But he did say with no uncertainty of meaning that the most hateful thing in human nature is pride, hypocrisy, greed, hatred, in short, Pharisaism. Today, the church persistently and consistently denounces lesser evils and harbors, pets, and pampers the most destructive vices. Protestant churches are full of successful and proud Pharisees. Protestantism pays a premium to the materially successful man or woman, regardless of how cold and hard and cruel his or her heart may be. No wonder the man of the world, whose ideas about ethics have changed with changing

centuries, views with suspicion a church which can give seats of highest honor to those whom he knows to be the self-same kind of cruel Pharisees that Jesus so bitterly denounced. The very word "morals" means "mores," customs, manners; and the ideal is bound to change with changing usages. The emphasis will forever alter with altering periods; but the hostility of the Christian church should be forever the hostility of its founder and should burn brightly and destroyingly against all inner sins, all hardness, all bitterness, all coldness and cruelty, all lovelessness in whatever form. Here stalks the relentless enemy of Jesus and his church. Here roams the only devil there is. Here he reigns in human hearts and human spirits. And here is the unending mission of the church, to drive him out like a devil and to destroy him.

IV. PERHAPS IT IS DAWN, NOT SUNSET

Is there hope that after all Protestantism may not die but may revive, increase, grow, and survive through the centuries? There are signs of hope. The fact that the human heart is incurably religious, cannot remain at peace without religion, is the highest hope of all. Napoleon Bonaparte, hard-headed, sceptical, believing little or nothing, when he went to set up his empire and the Code Napoleon, turned to his advisers one day and said, "Now what religion shall be have? A nation has to have a religion. It cannot survive, cannot hold together, without a religion." It made no difference to Napoleon whether that religion were Christian or Moslem, Catholic or Protestant, just so it was a religion.

Russia has practically succeeded in destroying the old

Orthodox church, but it has not succeeded and it can scarcely succeed in destroying religion in the hearts of its people. Protestantism, if given half a chance, would sweep Russia from end to end. While in Russia I heard of a village of three thousand which under Communism had been converted, to a man and woman, from the old Greek Orthodox church. Then a Baptist revivalist came along and re-converted the entire village, men, women and children, from atheism to Protestantism and baptized them all. Russia is ripe for a free religion. So perhaps is all the rest of the world. Given half a chance, set free from ecclesiasticisms, dominations, intolerances, allowed to think for itself and to feel for itself, the whole world, it is not too much to believe, would turn to a large and living faith. The varieties of religious experience too, must be as numerous as the different phases of religious thought and religious observance. The church that is ultimately to prevail with humanity must adapt itself to nationality, to climate, to individual idiosyncrasy, to class, to all the invisible cleavages that run through the social structure. For such a Protestantism, large and wise and tolerant, there is just as much ground for hope as there is reality to the ineradicable religion that lies at the basis of human life.

There is no way to prove by facts and figures the advent of a new and hopeful time just ahead for Protestantism; and it is very easy, no doubt, for one biased in its favor to find on the horizon traces of the coming dawn; nevertheless, perhaps it is safe to give some weight to these indications. There is, for example, a manifest tendency toward amalgamation of denominations. A

spirit of union is in the air in Protestant conventions and in individual congregations. Like the union of churches in Canada, there is brewing a union of certain churches in the United States. The consummation of actual union among individual congregations in great cities goes forward. The community church springing up in villages, towns, and rural districts so rapidly all over the American continent almost keeps pace with the growth of community high schools. There is a noticeable tendency toward improved business methods in many great churches. There is an increasing adoption of new and unusual methods in great city churches and even in smaller ones. Many ministers are revolting against the chains of untruthfulness and insincerity with which they have so long been bound down. Many congregations are granting to their ministers greater liberty to think and freely to speak their thoughts. Theological controversy grows unfashionable and increasing emphasis is placed by thoughtful leaders upon economic and social reforms. Many men are studying conscienciously how to dissipate the dullness of the seventeenth century forms of worship and to bring the twentieth century inside the four church walls.

How Protestantism may be made to grow in power and influence and in service to mankind has perhaps already been suggested in this chapter. It remains but to sum up by enumerating certain characteristics which must be fostered if such a happy future is to be assured.

First of all, real religion must become the burden of its song; not denominational religion, not dogmatic religion, not a religion that may be labeled at all, but

religion. Refuse all labels as an essential part of the Protestant free spirit. To define is to restrict; to label religion is to destroy it. We all know what religion is, but none of us can define it. This real religion, with every man's own idea of God, this is an inalienable possession of every human being and needs only to be fostered and allowed to grow.

It goes without saying that such real religion calls for the utmost tolerance each toward the other. No one of us can think or believe any differently from what he does think or believe. No one of us can successfully impose his own manner of thinking and believing and feeling upon another; therefore, to live and let live, think and let think, believe and let believe, feel and let feel, must be the very soul of a progressing Protestantism. Intolerance is futility, leads to defeat and despair, shuts out instead of takes in, makes for the failure of whoever tries its impossible and absurd task.

Looked at from the other side, freedom for the individual within the Protestant church, freedom consistent with the welfare of the social whole, is one of the requisites for a conquering instead of a decadent church. Freedom in the pulpit to speak without fear and favor, and freedom in the pew to accept or reject what is spoken from the platform—without this liberty which Jesus taught and lived, there can be no successful future for the Protestant church.

Protestantism to win must capture the interest of twentieth-century people. Good pedagogy calls first of all for the stimulation of interest. Boredom is the death of the school room and the church. The church, like the

skilful teacher, must use the process called apperception, must capture the student or the worshiper where he is and with his present stock of interests and must lead him on, step by step, to higher and further interests. The language that he knows, the concepts that are familiar, the contacts that are of his day and not of an age long gone into the past, these the church must seize upon to catch the attention of the present time. All means and methods, all arts and crafts, that live in our day, the church must make her own if her hold is not to slip.

Whatever, then, is human, whatever makes for the good of human beings, whatever promotes human welfare, whatever sets humanity free from ignorance, from fear, from suppression of personality, whatever builds up the well-being of mankind and contributes to beauty of character and achievement and expression, that is the business of the church. After all, it is human beings that compose the only real world. All the rest is only setting, framework, for humanity. The real religion concerns itself with human beings and human well-being. Whatever is beautiful, whatever is true, whatever is lovely, whatever is comradely, whatever promotes fellowship and harmony and love, that the church must find and use to win men, as the charming Master of Nazareth won them. Doing this, it cannot wane, it cannot fail.

Index

Acts, 37
Addams, Jane, 159
Africa, 135
African slave trade, 137
Alcohol, 191
Allen, James Lane, 15
Alms, 146
America, 20, 49
American colleges non-sectarian, 166
American colonies, 221
American idealism, 230
American imperialism, 118, 121, 227
Americanism, 100%, 3
Americans, provincial, 2
Ames, E. S., 180, 201, 207
Anabaptists, 23
Anglo-Saxon, 4
Anonymous letters, 8
Antioch college, 171
Aristophanes, 193
Army discipline, 43
Art, 195
Asceticism, 58, 98, 181, 182, 202
Aspasia, 98
Associated charities, 148
Atheists, 209

Bakeless, John, 66
Baptism, 86
Baur, Ferdinand C., 36
Beauty, 205, 213
Beliefs, 54, 210
"Beloved community," 237
Bible, infallible, 20, 28, 31, 33, 36
Bible verses, 32
Birth control, 117
Booth, Charles, 148
British East India company, 128
Brotherhood, 214
Brown, Rollo Walter, 175
Business ethics, 47
Business methods, 255

Cabot, Richard C., 149, 160
Cadman, S. Parkes, 12, 218
Calvin, John, 22, 59, 182, 219
Campbell, Alexander and Thomas, 23
Capitalism, 56
Carey, William, 129
Carlyle, Thomas, 55
Cavell, Edith, 225
Charity, 8, 146
Charity organizations, 148
Child bearing, 91
Child labor, 153
Child psychology, 43, 45
Child welfare, 156
Children, 108, 115
China, 132
Chivalry, 98, 217
Christian civilization, 84
Christian socialism, 158
Christianity, 181, 199, 217
Christianity and woman, 95
Christianity, 19th century, 126
Church, 49, 78, 260

Church members, 252
Citizenship, 9
Civilization, 155
Civilization complex, 188
Clergy take wives, 99
Codex Alexandrinus, 34
Codex Sinaiticus, 35
Community churches, 86
Competition, 63
Comstock law, 118
Conscience money, 241
Conservatives, 19
Cook, Captain, 141
Criticism, 176
Crusades, 165
Customs, 90
Cyril, 126

Dancing, 188
Darwin, Charles, 140
Death rate, 118
Degrees, college, 174
Democracy, 178
Denmark, 221
Denominational colleges, 165, 167
Discipline, 46, 168
Dissension, 256
Divorce, 105, 113
Dom, in Berlin, 250
Drama, 188
Duff, Alexander, 130
Dunlap, Knight, 199
Durant, Will, 73

East, Edward M., 120
Ecclesiasticism, 50, 147
Education, 72, 116, 119, 162
Egoism, 81
Eighteenth amendment, 242
Eliot, Charles W., 248
Elizabethan era, 99
Emotion, 211, 213
England, 220
Epistle of James, 28
Epistles of Paul, 28
Erasmus, 29
Ethics, business, 61, 64, 67
Ethics, family, 71
Ethics of Christianity, 196
Ethics of Jesus, 61, 65, 67, 71, 106, 214, 258
Eucharist, 21
Eugenics, 157

Faith, 12
Family affections, 112, 124
Family relations, 45
Fatigue, 152
Fear, 90
Federal council of churches, 85, 152, 242
Filene, Edward A., 48, 64, 72
Fish on Friday, 94
Ford, Henry, 64
Fourth gospel, 200
France, 220
Frank, Glenn, 171, 176
Freedom in education, 167
Freedom of teaching, 176
Freedom of thought, 41, 261, 262
Freedom of woman, 101, 114
Fundamentalism, 23

Games, 188
Gandhi, Mahatma, 131
Geddie, John, 140
Genesis, 38
Gibbs, Sir Philip, 15
Gladstone, W. E., 21
God, 208, 212
Golden rule, 48, 61, 72, 198, 243

Gospels, 234
Government, 49
Greece, 216
Greek architecture, 193
Greek civilization, 197
Greek influence, 182, 199, 214
Groos, Prof. Karl, 184

Haley, T. P., 10
Hapgood, William, 48, 72
Harper, William Rainey, 173
Hermits, 200
Higher criticism, 36
Hindu influence, 200
History in schools, 225
Hocking, W. E., 212
Hogarth, William, 194
Holt, Hamilton, 170
Home, 107, 124
Hopkins, Pres. E. M., 175
Hort, Dr. F. J. A., 35
Hospitals, 160
Housing, 153
Hull House, 159
Humanity gregarious, 215
Huxley, T. H., 206

Idealism, 229
Imperialism, 145
India, 131
Individualism, 99, 107, 111
Industrial era, 150
Industrial life, 107
Industrialism in Japan, 134
Inertia, 81
Infant baptism, 128
Inge, Dean W. R., 54, 113, 205, 248
Intelligence quotient, 3
Internationalism, 223, 250
Intolerance, 9

Jacks, L. P., 182, 250
Japan, 133
Jerome, 27
Jesuits, 127
Jesus, 49, 51, 60, 61, 83, 97, 180, 183, 197, 236, 263
Jews, 5, 11
Joan of Arc, 164,191, 220
Judson, Adoniram, 130

Kagawa, Toyohiko, 134
Kellogg peace pact, 245
Kindness, 73
King James translation, 30
Kingdom of God, 49, 51, 72, 74, 105, 162, 232
Knox, John, 220

Labor, 158, 242, 251
Labor party, 57
Labrador, 127
Langdon-Davies, John, 104
Laughter, 189
Laws, 52
League of nations, 224, 245
Learning, 164
Leuba, J. H., 208
Libraries, 164
"Limies," 2
Lippmann, Walter, 44, 161
Literature, 188
Livingstone, David R., 136
Locke, John, 32
Logia, 38
Logic, 42
Lombroso, Gina, 94
Lord's supper, 8, 86
Love, 51
Loyola, 127
Luther, Martin, 19, 21, 28, 59, 182, 202, 219

Macaulay, 8
Machine age, 107

Magic, 90
Malthus, 62, 117
Mann, Horace, 171
Manuscripts of Bible, 8
Marriage, 92
Matthew, 38
Meiklejohn, Alexander, 171
Membership, 87
Mergers, 63
Methodists, 23
Methodius, 126
Mind, 17, 20
Minimum wage, 159
Ministry, 250
Minorities, 10
Missions, 126
Moffat, Robert, 135
Monogamy, 53, 108, 112, 123
Morality, definitions of, 161
Morals, 44
Moravians, 127
Morgan, Arthur E., 171
Morrison, Robert, 132
Myers, Gustavus, 230
Mystery, 199

Napoleon I, 259
Narcotics, 191
Nash, Arthur, 48, 72
Nature, 194
Negro problem, 9
Neighborliness, 161
New Testament, 38
Niebuhr, Reinhold, 56
Nordic, 4
Norway, 221

Ogburn, W. F., 112
O'Neil, Eugene, 194
Ossoli, Margaret Fuller, 55

Palimpsests, 34
Parental domination, 122
Parochial schools, 165
Parsons, Geoffrey, 221
Patriarchal authority, 107
Patrick, G. T. W., 185, 191, 192
Patriotism, 215, 225, 227
Paul, 1, 24, 193
Peace, 244
Pensions, 159
Perry, Commodore O. H., 133
Personality, 47, 49, 54
Phraseology, 254
Pilgrims, 221
Play, 183
Polyandry, 53
Polygamy, 53
Polynesia, 139
Poor laws, 148
Poverty, 146
Prayer, 212
Preaching, 248
Prejudice, 2
Priesthood, 7
Profanity, 191
Progress, 41
Property, 69
Prophets, 212
Protestant scholarship, 235
Protestantism dishonest, 253
Protestantism waning? 248
Provident associations, 148
Puritanism, 100
Puritans, 182, 221

Race prejudice, 5
Race relations, 243
Radicals, 19
Rauschenbusch, Walter, 241
Reason, 1, 206, 211, 213
Reformation, 19, 59, 99, 147, 164, 182, 215, 217
Relaxation, 187

Religion, 124, 199, 262
Religion and education, 178
Religion necessary, 259
Religious experience, 54
Religious life, 181
Renaissance, 16, 99, 164, 181, 217
Renan, Ernest, 233
Ricardo, 62
Rollins college, 170
Roman Catholic church, 39, 58, 98, 147
Roman Catholics, 6, 11, 13, 20
Roman games, 187
Rome, 216
Ross, E. A., 238
Royce, Josiah, 237
Russell, Bertrand, 57, 180
Russia, 57, 102
Russia religious, 260

Sabbath, 183
"Safety first," 151
St. Patrick, 164
Santayana, George, 113
Sarto, Andrea del, 68
Schools, 163
Schwartz, Christian Frederick, 128
Schweitzer, Albert, 233
Science and mysticism, 203
Scientific era, 147
Scott, J. F., 225
Sects, 21, 24, 75
Secularization of schools, 165
Segregation, 9
Self-respect, 161
Septuagint, 27
Sermon on the mount, 61, 198
Servetus, 22
Sex education, 115
Sexes, 93, 99
Shaftesbury, Earl of , 148
Shaw, Bernard, 57
Sin, 180, 238, 258
Sisters, 7
Smith, Adam, 62
Snobbery, 83
Social Christianity, 238, 246
Social classes, 70
Social settlements, 159
Social welfare, 146
Social worker's goal, 161
Society, 48
Sophocles, 193
South Seas, 139
Spencer, Herbert, 184
Spiritual, 192
Spirituality, 85
Sports, 185
Stanley, Henry M., 139
Strauss, David F., 233
Student government, 175
Subsidize artists, 195
Swarthmore college, 174
Sweden, 221
Swiss, 219
Synoptic gospels, 39

Taboos, 90
Tagore Rabindranath, 131
Tawney, R. H., 57
Taylor, Graham, 159
Teachers, 169
Ten commandments, 52, 258
Tennyson, Alfred, Lord, 154
Testament, Greek, 35
Textual criticism, 33
Thinking, 82
Thoburn, Bishop J. M., 142
Tischendorf, L. F. K., 34
Tolerance, 262
Tolstoi, 49, 104
Toynbee, Arnold, 159

Trance, 201
Traquair, Ramsey, 105
Troubadour, 189
Truth, 76
Tyndale, William, 29

United Brethren, 127
Unity, 24, 79, 144, 261
University of Wisconsin, 171
Urban people, 107
Usury, 58

Van Dyke, Henry, 15
Victorian era, 100
Vulgate, 27, 34

War, 64, 66, 118, 191, 247
Ward, H. F., 62
Warner, Amos G., 154
Washington, George, 20
Wealth, 63
Webb, Sidney, 57
Weber, Max, 56
Welfare work, 213
Welfare worker, 151
Wells, H. G., 57
Westcott, Bishop B. F., 35
Williams, E. V., 10
Wilson, Woodrow, 224
Women and the home, 111
Wordsworth, William, 241
Working conditions, 150
World court, 224, 245
World war, 222, 229
Wyclif, John, 29, 218

Xavier, Francis, 128

Young, Owen B., 152

Zwingli, Ulrich, 21

BOOK TO BE RETURNED

MY 1 '60				

284
J52

Jenkins, Burris Atkins
AUTHOR

The world's debt to Protestantism.
TITLE

27520

Date Due	Borrower's Name
MY 1 '60	Lee Carlson

284
J52

Jenkins, Burris Atkins
The world's debt to
Protestantism.

27520